

A VALIDATIONAL STUDY OF THE
LIFE ROLE EXPECTATIONS SCALES

BY

JACK EDWARD CLARK

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1984

Copyright 1984

by

Jack Edward Clark

In loving memory of
my father, Edward Bliss Clark.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express appreciation to my chairperson. Dr. Ellen Amatea has been a source of support and encouragement throughout my doctoral program. Many thanks go to Dr. Larry Loesch and Dr. Stephen Olejnik for their timely comments and efforts. A very special thanks goes to Dr. Wilson Guertin. His help in the data analysis was offered out of a pure interest in teaching. I truly enjoyed working with him.

To my friends, Herb Steier and Andres Nazario, I extend my appreciation for their help in collecting data. Sincere recognition goes to Katherine Williams and her staff for producing an excellently typed product, often on very short notice.

I dedicated this project to the memory of my father, Edward Clark, for the love and encouragement he gave me. It has lasted a lifetime. To my mother, Shirley Dougherty, I express my love and gratitude. She always trusted and believed in me. I thank Gary Clark for being my first friend and a loving brother.

I wish to thank both my sons, Brian and Michael, for providing me with the pleasure of being a father. A special

thanks to Brian for his patience with me and for always being there with a hug and kiss.

Above all, I wish to express gratitude to my wife and best friend, Barbara. I never had to look far for someone to listen and give me support. She was always there and I dearly love her for that.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
ABSTRACT	x
CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION	1
Scope of the Problem	2
Need for the Study	9
Purpose of the Study	9
Rationale for the Study	9
Importance of the Study	10
Definition of Terms	11
Organization of the Study	13
CHAPTER TWO REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	14
Psychological Perspectives	15
Masculinity/Femininity	15
Androgyny	17
Sex Role Transcendence	25
Sociological Perspectives	29
Role Dimensions	30
Career Salience	34
Salience in Other Areas	39
Power Dimensions	44
Role Conflict	50
Role Interaction	54
Developmental Perspectives	58
Stage Theory	59
Life Events Theory	60
Criticisms of Stage and Life Events Models	61
Measurement Problems	68
College Students and Life Roles	73
Summary and Implications	76

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER THREE METHODOLOGY	79
Research Questions	79
Instrumentation	80
Life Roles Expectation Scales (LRE Scales)	80
Demographic Data Sheet	84
Sample	84
Selection of Subjects	84
Description of Subjects	86
Data Collection and Recording Procedures	89
Statistical Analyses	92
Factor Structure of LRE Scales	92
Reliability of LRE Scales	94
Methodological Assumptions and Limitations	94
CHAPTER FOUR RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	97
Validity	97
Factor Structure of the LRE Scales	97
Comparison of the Proposed and Derived Factor Structures	115
Reliability	118
Internal Consistency of the LRE Scales	118
Temporal Stability of the LRE Scales	118
CHAPTER FIVE CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	121
Conclusions	123
Unisex Form of LRE Scales	123
Independence of Factors	124
Validity of Role Reward Value Scales	125
Validity of Level of Role Participation Scales	127
Reliability of Proposed LRE Scales	128
Implications	130
Recommendations	131
Revision of the LRE Scales	132
Recommendations for Future Research	133

	Page
Summary	136
APPENDICES	
A LIFE ROLE EXPECTATIONS SCALES	138
B DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET	143
C INFORMED CONSENT FORM	144
D FACTOR LOADINGS FOR ITEMS FOLLOWING PRINCIPAL AXES FACTOR ANALYSIS WITH ORTHOGONAL ROTATION USING MALE SAMPLE	146
E FACTOR LOADINGS FOR ITEMS FOLLOWING PRINCIPAL AXIS FACTOR ANALYSIS WITH ORTHOGONAL ROTATION USING FEMALE SAMPLE	150
REFERENCES	154
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	166

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. The Life Role Expectations Scales	82
2. Description of Subjects Expressed as Percentage of Total Sample (N=434)	88
3. Items with Factor Loadings of at Least .50 on Male and Female Factors Expressed by Item Numbers	99
4. Factor Loadings for Items Following Principal Axes Factor Analysis with Orthogonal Rotation Using Combined Sample	101
5. Factor Structure of LRE Scales	106
6. Loadings for Items of Each Factor Following Principal Axes Factor Analysis with Orthogonal Rotation for Each Sex and Combined Sample	113
7. Temporal Stability and Internal Consistency Data for Each Proposed LRE Scale	119
8. Example Form of Life Role Expectations Scales . .	134

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

A VALIDATIONAL STUDY OF THE
LIFE ROLE EXPECTATIONS SCALES

By

Jack Edward Clark

April, 1984

Chairperson: Ellen Amatea

Major Department: Counselor Education

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the validity and reliability of the Life Role Expectations Scales (LRES). This instrument was proposed to measure a person's expectations regarding the role reward value of and the level of role participation in occupational, marital, and parental roles.

The responses of 434 undergraduates, 200 males and 234 females, were factor analyzed to investigate two major questions: 1) What was the nature of the LRES factor structure? 2) Were the proposed LRES factors supported? The proposed scales were also analyzed for internal consistency and temporal stability.

Similar male and female LRES factor structures supported the appropriateness of factor analyzing the combined

sample. Forty-five of the sixty items were shown to load on eight independent factors.

The eight factor structure provided the most support for three of the proposed scales. These were the Marital Role Reward Value (MV), Parental Role Reward Value (PV), and Level of Occupational Role Participation (OP) Scales. The items of the proposed Level of Marital Role Participation (MP) and Level of Parental Role Participation (PP) scales loaded together on two factors. These factors apparently measured 1) Temporal Participation and 2) Decision-Making Participation in home roles. The proposed Occupational Role Reward Value (OP) scale was partially addressed by two factors that apparently measured 1) Career Success Reward Value and 2) Work as a Necessity.

Coefficient Alpha analyses indicated the proposed MP scale lacked internal consistency. The proposed OV, OP, and MP scales lacked sufficient evidence of being stable over time.

A revision of the LRES factor structure was recommended with a reduction in the number of items and a relabeling of the suggested scales. In addition, further research on the instrument was suggested. Such research may include factor analytic study, the use of the revised scales as predictors of related criteria, and a reexamination of temporal stability.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Due to the societal changes that have occurred over the past ten to twenty years, many of our conceptions about how work, marital, and parental role responsibilities are to be fulfilled and who is to fulfill them have greatly changed. There is increasing support for women to enter the work force, and for men to become more involved in the family (Berger, 1979; Robinson, Rotter, & Wilson, 1982). Additionally, individual expectations concerning the importance of different life roles and the amount of responsibility to assume in implementing such roles have grown more diverse (Albrecht, Bahr, & Chadwick, 1979). With this transition, there has been increased emphasis on reconceptualizing and assessing life roles (Scanzoni & Fox, 1980).

This focus on life roles is important. Social institutions, such as business, government, and education, need to respond to these societal changes. By understanding individual preferences for life roles, interventions will be better able to enhance the future role choices of young people (Rocney, 1983). Life role theory and research can improve this understanding and provide the knowledge base for such interventions.

Scope of the Problem

Several different perspectives have been used to conceptualize and assess life roles. These perspectives can be classified into three categories--psychological, sociological, and developmental. Each has both distinctive characteristics and limitations.

The psychological perspective has emphasized the concept of sexual identity as the major construct for organizing life role preferences (Brogan & Kutner, 1976). Early considerations of the masculinity-femininity construct led to a model of psychological health that supported sex differentiation. Variations from sex-appropriate behavior by some individuals was labelled "deviant" (Harrison, 1978; Robinson & Green, 1981). In reaction to this perspective, Sandra Bem (1974) proposed the concept of androgyny, an integration of both masculine and feminine traits within a single individual. Psychological health was viewed in a way that contradicted previous conceptions since sex differentiation was seen as problematic for the individual (Bem, 1975).

Both the masculinity/femininity and androgyny constructs, as sex trait theories, are susceptible to similar criticisms (Harrison, 1978). They use sexual identity to predict role behavior and attitudes while disregarding contextual variables (Anastasi, 1981). Although Bem (1974, 1975) saw role adaptability as desirable, both theories deemphasize intraindividual differences over time. Sexual

identity is viewed as a stable personality trait. The M/F and androgyny constructs are also criticized for their emphases on differentiating masculinity and femininity with little attention being paid to their similarities (Anastasi, 1981; Skovholt & Morgan, 1981).

The utility of the M/F and androgyny scales has also been questioned. The norms on which the M/F scales were based are outdated (Brogan & Kutner, 1976) and the androgyny measurements use traits linked to prototypical male and female family/work roles. In addition, factor analytic studies have not supported their theoretical factor structure (Locksley & Colten, 1979; Pedhazur & Tetenbaum, 1979).

In response to the sex trait theories, sex role trans^{*}cendence theory has emerged as a recent, yet unexplored conceptualization of sex roles. In this theory gender is rejected as a determinant of behavior. What is emphasized is a dynamic and flexible orientation by which behavior and lifestyles are chosen according to the demands of a specific situation (Hefner, Rebecca, & Oleshansky, 1975; Rebecca, Hefner, & Oleshansky, 1976). Unfortunately, transcendence theory is embryonic in its development. It lacks research and adequate measures to confirm theory and identify a 'transcendent' person (Robinson & Green, 1981).

The sociological perspective on life roles has been generally concerned with examining social roles in terms of group differences. In this perspective a life role is defined by the context in which attitudes and behavior

occur and sex roles are assessed by noting differences between the sexes in response to specific life role contexts.

Role theory has been of central importance in the social-psychological literature, with a specific emphasis having been in the area of role expectations. Role expectations have been considered with regards to both external and internal domains (Amatea & Cross, 1983; Parsons & Shils, 1951; Super, 1980; Thibaut & Kelly, 1959). External role expectations are expressed to the person by outside forces and are a concern for socialization processes. The types of beliefs a person adopts and internalizes comprise the internal domain of role expectations.

A more specific aspect of internal role expectations is the variable of role preference. This is the desire to adopt behavior associated with a role or the perception of such behavior as desirable (Lynn, 1966), and suggests that commitment or preference for a role varies in degree for different individuals.

The sociological perspective has been criticized for not addressing current trends of a changing society. While there is an interest in defining the context in which behavior occurs, this has been approached quite narrowly. The concern has been with specific role contexts and not with how they interact and mutually influence each other. Because of the increasing diversity of roles in which people participate, some have suggested that this is the only

tenable way to consider the major life arenas (Blaska, 1978; Kamerman, 1979). Instrumentation that is multicontextual would aid this approach, but is virtually non-existent (Brogan & Kutner, 1976; Tittle, 1983).

Conceptualizations that have assumed positive preferences for different life role areas have also been problematic. This has been especially true in regards to career theories (Fuchs, 1971; Super, 1980A, 1983; Zytowski, 1965). The dimension of role salience has emerged in response to this problem as a variable index of role importance. But this dimension has been applied mostly to the work arena (Almquist & Angrist, 1970; Greenhaus, 1971; Masih, 1967; Pendleton, Poloma, & Garland, 1980; Sekaran, 1982, 1983). There has been less concern with determining the salience of marital and parental roles (Albrecht, Bahr, & Chadwick, 1979). In addition, research on the career salience dimension has been limited, vague, contradictory, and inconclusive. Because it is relevant to today's changing society, it warrants further exploration, however.

Sociological research has also addressed the dimension of power, especially as it relates to marital and family role involvement. Yet the two major perspectives from which this dimension has been approached are deficient in some manner. The "relative-resource" hypothesis offers little conceptual basis for a dynamic understanding of the relationship between a spouse's resources and their level of role involvement (Farkas, 1976; Stafford, Backman, & Dibona,

1977). The "decision-making" hypothesis offers a more promising measure of power (Safilios-Rothschild, 1971; Scanzoni & Fox, 1980) since it directly addresses this aspect of involvement. But instrumentation that addresses one's expectations of these decision-making processes is lacking or of poor psychometric quality.

Another recent consideration has been the developmental nature of life roles, but research to confirm theory has been somewhat difficult and outdated. Rossi (1980) pointed out that a great deal of theory has been based on research done with people who were either born during the Depression or grew up in families that had experienced it. She questions the applicability of their findings to subsequent generations. Also, because of the time and effort needed, it is difficult to make a commitment to conduct longitudinal research (Margrabi & Marshall, 1965). This difficulty contributes to research not taking into account the sequential nature of life role dimensions (Harrison, 1978).

Contributing to the inadequacies in life role research are several measurement problems. First, there has been an inordinate amount of attention paid in instrument development to the concerns of women (Komarovsky, 1973; O'Neil, 1981). This is especially true in role measurement scales (Beeres, 1979). Second, items of many role instruments reflect sexist attitudes to the disadvantage of the woman (Beeres, 1979; Straus & Brown, 1978). A third problem with measurement tools has been terminology. Inadequate and

differing labels and definitions contribute to making it difficult to compare studies. A fourth problem is that instruments are used with populations other than the population(s) with which validity and reliability have been established. Since factor structure can vary with age and sex, the misapplication of an instrument in this regard can produce misleading results (Anastasi, 1981; Cromwell & Wieting, 1975). Finally, the validity and reliability of many instruments has been poorly established, left unreported, or is completely lacking (Beeres, 1979; Straus & Brown, 1978; Van Sell, Brief, & Schuler, 1981).

In summary, evolving concepts in the investigation of life roles have suggested that sex typed traits are difficult to use as sole predictors of role behavior; that contextual differences influence attitudes and behavior; that similarities between the sexes are an important concern; that life roles are interactional in nature; and that the importance of differing roles varies from person to person. In addition, the developmental nature of life roles needs to be considered; males as well as females need to be included in life role research; and research is needed that investigates the processes underlying role involvement. Life role research based on these current trends and needs is lacking or in its early stages. As a result, most conceptualizations are largely theoretical and measurement tools that address or do not violate these evolving concepts are in short supply. Furthermore, instruments that are

available generally suffer from inadequate and/or unreported validation procedures.

One instrument that reflects many of these evolving concepts and needs is the Life Role Expectations Scales (LRE Scales) developed by Amatea and Cross (1983) to measure a person's expectations in regards to the dimensions of role reward value and level of role participation. Role reward value is the extent to which rewards accruing from role membership are valued by the individual and viewed as a major source of self definition and expression. Level of role participation is the extent to which the individual takes responsibility for and an active role in the development, implementation, expansion, and management of role activities. Both dimensions are measured for the role content areas of occupation, marriage, and parenthood, resulting in six proposed subscales.

The LRE Scales are multicontextual and concerned with varying levels of role expectations. The wording of the items (see Appendix A) makes them appropriate for use with either sex and for assessing similarities as well as differences between the sexes. They address a person's expectations of processes underlying role involvement. Finally, the instructions for responding to the LRE Scales make them appropriate for use with populations who have or have not implemented these life roles. Therefore they could be used to better understand the developmental nature of role expectations.

Need for the Study

Although the Life Role Expectations Scales are conceptually very promising, they lacked empirical support. The LRE Scales needed to be judged statistically valid and reliable in order to be used in research and practice. This validation research also needed to be conducted on populations for which the LRE Scales were designed. Without this type of study, the information generated by the LRE Scales would be of questionable value.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to begin to establish whether the LRE Scales are valid and reliable. A male and female university population was used to investigate the construct validity, temporal stability, and internal consistency of the proposed LRE Scales. A primary concern in this study was whether the item structure of the derived factors supported the item structure of the proposed factors. In addition, this study examined whether or not the use of a unisex form is possibly warranted by assessing similarities in the LRE scales' factor structure for male and female subgroups.

Rationale for the Study

The LRE Scales were developed for potential use with two different population types: those who have and those who have not yet fully enacted occupational, marital, and

parental roles. Since most college students plan to enact these roles, a university population was an appropriate validation group.

For this phase of the LRE Scales' development, the determination of its factor structure is a first step toward investigating the construct validity of the instrument. Therefore the factor analytic method was chosen for this study.

Importance of the Study

There are two potential benefits to be derived through the further development of this instrument. First, a more elaborate measure could be used in life role research. Secondly, an effective tool for counseling with college populations could be made available.

The LRE Scales might be used in research to further understand the interaction of work and non-work role expectations. Another contribution to research might involve examining the relationship of the LRE Scales to other concurrent information and behavior. Comparisons of university subgroups could be conducted to see if there are significant differences in role expectations. Developmental research could be enhanced by examining the life role expectations of a university population prior to enacting these roles and comparing these expectations to subsequent behaviors as these roles are implemented.

The LRE Scales could contribute to an expanded counseling framework that would assist "college students to develop awareness, to explore, and to acquire the skills necessary for choice and implementation of a variety of patterns in adult roles" (Tittle, 1982, p. 156). This instrument might, over time, be used to provide the practitioner with differing role expectation profiles of students. University counselors would be better able to address individual student needs by not assuming that occupational, marital, and parental roles carry the same meaning for everyone. University counseling centers interested in premarital counseling could potentially utilize the LRE Scales to compare a future couple's role expectations and identify congruences or potential conflicts. Career and life planning courses and groups could also use the LRE Scales to generate discussion and awareness of life roles and their mutual influence on each other.

The importance of this study lies in these potential contributions to research and counseling with a university population. Without being subjected to a rigorous study of their psychometric properties, these possible contributions of the LRE Scales could never be realized.

Definition of Terms

There are several terms frequently used in this report. Although authors will define these terms differently, in this study they are defined as follows:

Derived Factor - A variable that is presumed to exist because of an interrelationship of test items that has been determined by empirical procedures.

Factor - When not referring to a derived or proposed factor, it is loosely used to refer to anything that is partly responsible for a result or outcome.

Factor analysis - A statistical method for extracting common factor variance from a group of measurements.

Factor structure - The makeup and number of factors that explain the intercorrelations among a group of items.

Internal validity - Empirical evidence that an instrument consists of those factors it proposes to measure. This is in terms of the item structure of the factor and does not refer to its nature.

Life roles - Those roles in which people typically become involved to some degree over the course of a lifetime.

Proposed factor - A variable that is presumed to exist due to theoretical reasoning.

Role - A function that characterizes a particular position or status of a person.

Role expectations - Those personal belief/cognitions held by an individual regarding the value and style of participating in a role.

Sex roles - Those roles in which people become involved in based on gender. The reference to life roles when there is a concern for the variable of sex.

Organization of the Study

The remainder of this report is organized into four chapters. In Chapter Two an extensive review of the life role literature and the various perspectives by which life roles have been conceptualized and assessed will be presented. Chapter Three contains a description of the research questions addressed, the sample population, the methodological procedures, and the methods of data analysis used in this study. Chapter Four includes the results of the data analyses. Chapter Five provides a summary of the research findings and the conclusions and implications to be drawn from the findings.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The literature review in this chapter will explore the different ways in which life roles have been conceptualized and investigated. Psychological, sociological, and developmental approaches to conceptualizing life roles will be presented in the first three sections of this chapter. In the fourth section common problems in life role measurement will be discussed. The fifth section describes current life role literature on the college-age student population. A summary of this review with implications for future research is presented in the final section.

When reviewing the psychological, sociological, and developmental perspectives of life roles, it is not surprising that some authors' concepts and research are difficult to clearly classify into one category or the other. Indeed, it is not suggested that psychologists, sociologists, and developmentalists operate in isolation. Each general perspective possesses distinguishing characteristics, however, making them useful for organizing information about how life roles have been conceptualized and assessed.

Psychological Perspectives

In regards to life roles, the major emphasis of the psychological literature has been the dimension of sexual identity (Harrison, 1978; Robinson & Green, 1981). Osmond and Martin (1975) defined "traditional" sex roles as those based on polar masculinity-femininity conceptions; and "modern" sex roles as "flexible and dynamic transcendence of sex-role constraints" (p. 745). A review of the psychological literature will examine this evolution from traditional to modern life style concepts and how these conceptualizations have influenced the ways life roles are examined and measured.

Masculinity/Femininity

Early considerations of masculinity and femininity led to a model of psychological well-being that emphasized sex differentiation. A primary assumption was that "healthy" or "normal" development entailed a sex-role identity (Robinson & Green, 1981). Learned through the process of identification with the parent of the same sex, variations from observed behavioral norms were considered deviant, if not pathological, and as a failure to acquire an adequate "sex-role identity" (Harrison, 1978).

Studies based on this perspective attempted to use sexual identity as a predictor of behavior. Illustrating the type of conclusions that such a perspective generated were the findings that feminine characteristics prevail in

social situations, whereas masculine characteristics prevail in work situations (Yockey, 1978). Hiller and Philliber (1982) predicted marital and career success by forming a marital typology based on gender identity. Chodorow's (1978) psychoanalytic analysis of human development equated masculinity with separation and femininity with attachment.

A major problem with this approach is the necessary inferential leap that must be taken from identity to behavior, with little concern for contextual variables. Since there is a great deal of variability from one situation to another (Anastasi, 1981), those typical behaviors related to one's measured sexual identity may depend upon the environment (for instance, one cannot assume that nurturance will be expressed both in the family and at work).

This differentiation of sex has led to an overemphasis on differences, with little attention being paid to similarities between the sexes (Skovholt & Morgan, 1981). Anastasi (1981) raised the question of whether or not instruments minimize or maximize sex differences. She claims that early M-F scales are illustrative of the latter. Items that failed to yield sex differences were rejected and failure to take this into account can lead to misuse and misinterpretation of test results.

It was felt by Brogan and Kutner (1976) that because our traditional notions have changed, the norms for M-F scales are no longer appropriate. Almquist and Angrist

(1970) found the M/F construct inadequate for predicting the salience or atypicality of occupational choices for college women. The "deviance" hypothesis portrays a negative image of women who express less traditional choices and attitudes, a notion that is inappropriate considering present circumstances and future trends.

The intent here is not to provide an extensive overview of the M/F construct, but make the point that it is being questioned. According to Constantinople (1973), the failure of researchers to demonstrate concurrent, predictive, and construct validity or reliability over time, has called into question the M/F construct's utility for social science research. Such questioning has been a major impetus to formulating new theories which might account for more flexibility and variability in the behavior of the sexes.

Androgyny

A consequence of the women's liberation movement has been a questioning of the masculine male and feminine female as typifying mental health (Bem & Lenny, 1976). A subsequent effort has been the concept of psychological androgyny, a "term that denotes the integration of both masculinity and femininity within a single individual" (Bem, Martyna, & Watson, 1976, p. 1016). This perspective considers a person as psychologically healthier if they are androgynous. The following quote illustrates this viewpoint:

I believe that our future salvation lies in a movement away from sexual polarization and the prison of gender toward a world in which individual roles and the modes of personal behavior can be freely chosen. The ideal toward which I believe we should move is best described by the term "androgyny." This ancient Greek word--ANDRO (male) and GYN (female)--defines a condition under which the characteristics of the sexes, and the human impulses expressed by men and women, are not rigidly assigned. (Heilburn, 1973, p. x)

This is a complete reversal of earlier thinking about psychological health. From this perspective, sex-typed individuals (those with a strong sexual identity) are now considered unhealthy. Bem (1975) summarized several studies in which she correlated high feminism with high anxiety, low self-esteem, and low social acceptance; masculinity with high anxiety, high neuroticism, and low self-acceptance. She claimed sex-typed boys and girls were found to have lower overall intelligence, lower spatial ability, and lower creativity. She concluded that "a nonandrogynous sex role can seriously restrict the range of behaviors available to an individual as he or she moves from situation to situation" (p. 634).

This new dimension of sexual identity has focused investigations on androgyny versus sex-typedness in relation to role expectations and behavior. Allgeier (1973) compared 40 college students in a two by two design [(sex-typed vs. androgynous) x (male vs. female)]. She found androgynous females had higher educational aspirations, desired fewer children, and placed more importance on work competency. The responses of males were not related to the sex-typing

variable. Robinson (1979) summarized the results of two studies and a two year follow-up study, showing that male caregivers in day care centers were characteristically androgynous. When asked to show which series of paired activities they would prefer to perform for pay, Bem and Lenney (1976) found sex-typed individuals more likely than androgynous or sex-reversed individuals to choose sex-appropriate activities, even if those choices cost them money. They also found sex-typed individuals engaging in cross-sex behavior would experience greater discomfort and more negative feelings about themselves. In regards to role adaptability, Bem (1975) found androgynous college students more able to act "masculine" in some instances and "feminine" in other instances. In contrast, non-androgynous individuals were deficient in one situation or the other, with feminine females being the most deficient.

The most widely used measure of Androgyny is the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI), developed by Bem (1974). It is an adjective rating scale consisting of twenty masculine, twenty feminine, and twenty neutral adjectives. It is considered appropriate for ages 12 and older. Four scores are obtained for masculinity (M), femininity (F), androgyny (A), and social desirability (SD). The M and F scores are the means of their respective items. The androgyny score is obtained by either simply subtracting the M score from the F score or by a more complicated procedure in which the difference is normalized with regards to their standard

deviations. Strahan (1975) has found a correlation of .98 between the two methods. The social desirability score is the mean rating of the neutral items, half being negative and half being positive in nature.

Item development and refinement resulted from the administration of 400 items to 50 male and 50 female college students and their ratings of each item's appropriateness for either sex. Items judged to be significantly more desirable for one sex or the other were retained for that sex category. Twenty items judged to be no more desirable for either sex were chosen for the neutral scale.

Test-retest reliability, using 28 college males and 28 college females over a test-retest period of four weeks, produced coefficients of .90(M), .90(F), .93(A), and .89(SD). Internal consistency was established by the coefficient alpha method, using two groups of college students ($n = 723$, $n = 194$). Respective results for the two groups were $M = .86, .86$; $F = .80, .82$; $A = .85, .86$; and $SD = .75, .70$ (Bem, 1974).

As evidence of validity, Bem (1974) offered comparisons of males and females on the masculinity and femininity scales. Each sex scored significantly different with males scoring higher on masculinity and females scoring higher on femininity. Others have offered support to construct validity by comparing BSRI scores to different job levels, cross-sex behavior, and homosexuality (Beeres, 1979).

The interscale comparability of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI), the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ), the PRF Andro Scale, and the masculinity-femininity scales of the Adjective Check List (ACL) was investigated by Kelly, Furman, and Young (1978). Because they have similar definitions of sex roles, are capable of designating androgyny, and yield four sex role categories by similar scoring procedures, they are used almost interchangeably in sex role research. But because these instruments sample different content domains, were developed using different psychometric and item selection procedures, and applied different criteria for validity and reliability, Kelly and his associates hypothesized they would produce dissimilar results. Their findings showed the majority of subjects were discrepantly classified when a second sex role inventory was used and only 30% of the subjects were classified the same across all four inventories. Therefore, serious questions are raised about the comparability of studies using different androgyny measures.

In a review of sex role research Harrison (1978) claims that Bem recognized the problem that masculinity and femininity were, by definition, negatively correlated and the characteristics of masculinity had a higher social value than femininity, but failed to refute the M/F construct for psychological research. Therefore, he sees androgyny as a "transitional" perspective which differs from the old M/F

paradigm, but still maintains the association of personality traits with sex differences between men and women.

Other writers have criticized the androgyny construct and approaches to its measurement. Locksley and Colten (1979) and Robinson and Green (1981) contend that androgyny still maintains the M/F dimension and has only redirected our conception of it. Instead of measuring masculinity and femininity as opposite ends of a continuum, androgyny presupposes them to be orthogonal personality constructs. Both the BSRI and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) were constructed exactly the same way as the M/F scales. They criticize the BSRI and PAQ for confounding traits generally distinguishing males and females with traits specific to highly sex segregated roles. This criticism is supported by research (Clifton, McGrath, and Wick, in Locksley & Colten, 1979) in which respondents were asked to check those adjectives describing the typical housewife, barmaid, club woman, career woman, and woman athlete. Reasoning that if a general stereotype of women existed, similar clusters of adjectives would exist across all roles. They instead found a low commonality of adjectives across roles, with only "active" being used to describe them all. Also, adjectives used to describe the typical housewife were very similar to those used in the BSRI and the PAQ. Locksley and Colten (1979) concluded the adjectives meeting the criterion for use in the BSRI and PAQ may be linked to prototypical female and male family/work roles and not sex per se.

Pedhazur and Tetenbaum (1979) have criticized the BSRI as an androgyny measuring tool. They based their criticisms on two studies they conducted. In the first study, the BSRI was administered to 1,464 graduate students. The same instructions given by Bem (1974) in the trait-selection phase were used. The feminine items of shy, gullible, and childlike were perceived as relatively undesirable or negative. This contrasts with Bem's contention (1974, 1975) that both the M and F traits are socially desirable. Three factor analyses were performed and using a factor loading of $> .40$ as the criterion for meaningfulness, the authors concluded there was no evidence that the BSRI traits comprise the three proposed subscales. Most of the masculine traits made up a single factor, but it appeared appropriate to refer to this factor as Instrumentality or Assertiveness. Some of the masculine traits were synonymous or close in meanings. Two other factors were obtained and were a combination of feminine and neutral traits. One was labelled interpersonal sensitivity, a positive dimension, and the second was labelled immaturity, a negative dimension.

Pedhazur and Tetenbaum (1979) conducted a second study using 571 graduate students. They examined the general similarity between male and female responses to each BSRI trait. Except for a large difference between sexes on the traits of "masculine", "feminine", and "athletic", all other differences ranged from .01 to .47, with a median of .16.

They concluded their findings strongly suggest that discrimination between males and females is almost exclusively due to the "masculine" and "feminine" items.

Although this reviewer would not discount this latter point, it should be kept in mind that smaller differences between male and female self-ratings might be expected with a sample consisting of graduate students. This requires as much consideration as Bem's (1974) use of an undergraduate population in her trait selection procedure. At best, one may surmise that conceptions of the "typical" man and the "typical" woman will vary from one population to another. Since the BSRI was developed using an undergraduate population, its use with very different populations should be questioned. For this reason, the factor analyses from the first study of Pedhazur and Tetenbaum may not show that the proposed factor structure doesn't exist; it just may not exist for a graduate population.

Gaudreau (1977) conducted a factor analysis on the BSRI and yielded four factors named femininity, masculinity, sex of subject, and neutral maturity. This study is mentioned as a research example in the other extreme which used a conglomeration of very different subjects. According to Guertin and Bailey (1970) this is poor methodology. Some degree of population homogeneity is desirable. Therefore, the results of this factor analytic study has to be questioned since this research attempted to verify factor structures for one population by using another population.

In summary, there are indeed questions regarding androgyny and the common methods of measuring this construct. A great many of these questions are due to a lack of appropriate and necessary validation research. Locksley and Colten (1979) contend that the appeal of the androgyny construct has overshadowed these concerns:

The politicization of the argument (for androgyny) has tended to obscure the fact that it makes specific psychological assertions about the nature of sex identity, definitions of masculinity and femininity, and appropriate means of measuring these phenomena. The validity of these assumptions and techniques for measurement should be assessed on scientific as well as political grounds. (p. 1018)

It can be argued, however, that this construct has stimulated a great deal of thought in regards to traditional conceptions of masculinity and femininity.

Sex Role Transcendence

The transcendence perspective is the most recent and unexplored perspective in regards to sex roles. At the present time, the literature is exclusively theoretical. Sex role transcendence has been developed as a reaction to sex trait theories, yet it is similar to the androgyny construct. Although a developmental theory, for these reasons it will be discussed in this section.

Sex role transcendence is defined as:

The achievement of a dynamic and flexible orientation to life in which assigned gender is irrelevant. For a transcendent person, individual behavioral and emotional choice is based upon the full range of possible human characteristics. Behaviors and lifestyles are chosen that are

appropriate and adaptive for the particular individual in the specific situation. (Hefner et al., 1975, p. 143)

The sex role transcendence perspective presents a developmental model of role behavior. The following three stage model is presented in the literature (Hefner, Rebecca, & Oleshansky, 1975; Rebecca, Hefner, & Oleshansky, 1976).

The first stage, labelled undifferentiated, is the period in which the child is in the process of ordering the very diffuse stimuli of the world. Initially, the child has an undifferentiated conception of sex roles and sex-typed behaviors and is unaware of societal restrictions based on biological sex. As the child moves through this stage, they begin to see people as either male and female, boy and girl and certain behaviors are valued based on this sexual dichotomy. In stage two, labelled polarized, the child connects such role prescriptions with a need to act accordingly. Socialization processes used by parents, peers, etc., play an important part in this point. There is an active acceptance of those behaviors in accordance with their biological sex and an equal rejection of those behaviors associated with the opposite sex. In general, they have learned to use the organizing technique of polarizing and use this in order to make sense of a continuous input of information. The problem becomes that this is not a temporary form of organizing information, but an ultimate adult goal in regard to sex role behavior. Polarization emphasizes differences and not similarities, although men

and women take part in a great number of similar activities. Transition to stage three begins in stage two and is generally fostered by conflicts, crisis, or contradictions that cause a person to reexamine their previous conceptions. This reexamining process requires the adoption of a new way of thinking and a transition away from polarization. Unlike the transition from stage I to stage II, the transition from II to III lacks comparable support in this society and is more difficult to accomplish. Stage three, sex role transcendence, is marked by the person's ability to move freely from situation to situation and to behave/feel appropriately and adaptively. Behavior and emotional expression is not determined by adherence to rigid sex-related prescriptions. Transcendence implies "flexibility (over time, over situation, and over personal moods), plurality, personal choice, and the development of new and emergent possibilities . . ." (Rebecca et al., 1976, p. 204).

Although Rebecca et al. (1976) credit Bem (1974) as partly responsible for inspiring their three-stage model of sex role development, they claim that it is different from many views of androgyny. The conceptions of androgyny that mean a society with no sex differences or the viewpoint of this construct as a stable personality trait are two perspectives that oppose the fluid, flexible, and developmental nature of the transcendence construct. They recognize that Bem (1974) stressed situational flexibility, but because it is defined as a personality trait, intraindividual changes

over time are deemphasized (Hefner et al., 1975). Due to the developmental conception of sex roles, they consider transcendence as encompassing "all that is covered by androgyny, but includes other forms of flexibility as well" (p. 154).

Sex role transcendence is a promising concept lacking any sort of direct confirmation by research. Hefner et al. (1975) suggests that research on the dynamic aspect of polarities--how disparate elements change over time and situation--would help to understand the intricacies of human behavior. Robinson and Green (1981) provide us with four suggestions for transcendence research. First, they suggest that this must be adequately and empirically dimensionalized. Researchers currently have no means to determine which percentage of the population functions at the transcendent level. Garnets and Pleck (1979) have introduced an operational definition that sees transcendence as a function of low sex role salience--the degree to which individuals link personality traits and behavior to sex and to which cultural norms influence their own ideals. Yet Robinson and Green (1981) claim they have not been able to differentiate transcendence from androgyny. Second, does the construct represent the characteristics of a stage? They suggest longitudinal studies would provide the most direct test of sequentiability. Third, transcendence research should ask to what extent does Kohlberg's moral development theory and this sex role development theory reflect similarities within

and between major developmental points. Finally, does the distinction from androgyny result in pragmatic implications? Without research, this distinction will remain an academic concern.

One could question that since stage II is when the child learns from others to polarize information into feminine and masculine, how will this process be influenced by parents, teachers, and others who operate in the transcendent stage of development? Because theory suggests that the polarizing technique is a healthy, desirable and functional step toward transcendence (Rebecca et al., 1976), does this suggest that transcendent parents may contribute to an unhealthy sex role development?

As a theory of sex role development, sex role transcendence presents and stimulates some new interesting ideas.

Sociological Perspectives

Whereas psychological researchers focus on individual personality traits, sociologists concern themselves with groups and the individual in relation to these groups. Therefore, the sociological perspectives are targeted on looking at the person in terms of social roles (Harrison, 1978). It is not that psychological perspectives are unconcerned with roles, but they generally attempt to predict role behavior based on certain personality characteristics. In contrast, the sociological perspectives address this behavior more directly.

Role Dimensions

Performance in a role is not solely a function of one's ability and the amount of effort put into the role. It is also affected by a person's perceptions of the role. Role Perception is defined as the direction of effort--the kinds of activities and behavior the individual believes he or she should engage in to perform successfully in the role (Heneman & Schwab, 1972). Yockey (1978) considers role 'perception' as the individual's belief system, and distinguishes this from role expectation, which is considered as a societal norm. Others make no distinction in the use of terms, but do so conceptually. Super (1980) considers role expectations as consisting of the "expectations of the observer" (societal norms) or the "conceptions of the player" (individual belief system). Amatea and Cross (1981) consider this dimension as expectations of the self, expectations of significant others, and expectations of what are the actual demands of the role.

It already becomes apparent that terminology becomes a problem (Beeres, 1979). A term (perception, expectation) means something different to each person using it. (This is a measurement problem that will be addressed later in this chapter.) A common thread running through these different perspectives, however, is that role perceptions and expectations have both an external and internal domain; those expressed by others to the individual and those held by the individual.

Expectations expressed to the individual is a concern for the socialization processes by which children and adults acquire and internalize values, attitudes, and behaviors. O'Neil (1981) considered gender identity as primarily learned and established in a person's childhood. Because much of the public believes sex roles are based on innate, genetic, and unchangeable biological differences, those expectations placed upon the young child cause the socialization process to result in separatedness of sex role behaviors. Tognoli (1979) saw childhood role socialization as one source of men's separation and alienation from the domestic space of the home. Scanzoni and Fox (1980) presented a much broader perspective of the socialization process to include not only childhood socialization, but also the premarital and marital socialization processes. The premise was that, although this initial learning influences subsequent decisions in later years, sex role preferences and behaviors learned at one point in life, could be altered later on. This viewpoint stems essentially from social learning theory. Social learning theory says that social agents shape behavior by explicit and implicit expectancies regarding appropriate behavior. This is done by the processes of a) shaping, b) imitation, and/or c) observational learning (Robinson & Green, 1981). Bandura and Walters (1963) claimed that sex-typed role behavior patterns result from learned conformity and this conformity reflects whatever is conveyed by the culture.

Parental influences that place role expectations on children have been considered particularly important. This led to research efforts that found, for example, that men and women with employed mothers perceive a smaller difference between masculine and feminine roles when compared to individuals with mothers who were not employed (Vogel, Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1970).

Expectations are conveyed to a person by more than parental influences. Kammeyer (1964) found a greater consistency between feminine personality traits and feminine role behavior for college females with a greater number of friends and who dated more frequently. It was hypothesized that communication feedback was increased (increasing the influence of peers) and this increased the potential for consistency.

The preceding discussion is concerned with role expectations expressed to the person. Based on role socialization theory, these role expectations originate from several sources and will influence the role expectations that one adopts and internalizes. If interested in individual beliefs, then another approach would be to directly assess them. Thibaut and Kelly (1959) refer to these personal expectations as the subjective definition of the role. Parsons and Shils (1951) considered them as the "particularistic" values characterizing a role (as opposed to "universalistic" values). Amatea (1983) specifically referred to these personal expectations as personal belief/

cognitions held by the individual which define the reward value of a role and the expected style of participation/ performance in that role. The reward value of a role is defined as the value assigned by the individual to specific outcomes or consequences believed by the individual to result from performance of the role. The style of participation is that set beliefs held by the individual concerning how they intend to perform the specific tasks or behaviors necessary to enact a role.

The part of the preceding definition that says "valued by the individual" adds a different element to the discussion of role expectations.√ It is one matter for a person to behold certain beliefs about a particular role, but it is another matter whether or not this person prefers that role and to what degree this is a preference.

As women have entered the world of paid employment in greater numbers, it has become apparent that not all working women can be considered in the same light; that work carries different meanings for different women (as well as men) and that there are differing levels of commitment. The major career theories have been criticized for assuming that all men and women who are working have positive attitudes toward work as a goal (Super, 1980A; 1983) and that vocational guidance operates on the premise that there is one perfectly satisfying occupation (Fuchs, 1971). It has been also suggested that the undifferentiated type on Kuder Preference Record and the Strong Vocational Interest Blank reflects

individuals who are expressing avoidance behavior in regards to work/careers (Zytowski, 1965).

In regards to life roles, Lynn (1966) defined role preference as the "desire to adopt behavior associated with one sex or the other or the perception of such behavior as preferable or more desirable" (p. 469). Scanzoni and Fox (1980), summarized the work of Blalock and Wilken and conceptualized the person's subjective orientation to a role as preferences or tastes. Instead of considering these preferences as constants, they saw them as variables that indicate the strength with which a person prefers the sets of rewards and costs associated with role performance. They saw social arrangements, such as gender relations, as partly a function of these subjective preferences. Faver (1982) referred to preferences as "attainment values;" the values a person attaches to doing well in a given achievement area. In a somewhat different and less direct manner, Dubin and Champoux (1977) referred to the preference for an environment in which the role will be performed, implying that features of the environment are particularly important to the individual. Another construct closely related to the concept of role preference is role salience, a construct most widely applied to the content area of careers.

Career Salience

As previously stated, many of the career theories have assumed that a person's work is of high importance. Green-

haus (1971) criticized traditional career theory for assuming a relatively high level of career salience. Career salience is an important dimension to the family in which both spouses work (Pendleton, Poloma & Garland, 1980). The Rapoports (1969) recognized this in their definition of the dual-career couple as different from the dual-working couple. We may question the applicability of the dated criticisms to present day career theory, but in fact relatively little research has been done on the dimension of career salience at this point (Sekaran, 1982).

Theorists have defined career salience in different ways. Masih (1967) defined it as the degree to which a person is career motivated, the degree to which an occupation is important as a source of satisfaction, and the degree of priority ascribed to an occupation among other sources of satisfactions. Rapoport and Rapoport (1969) saw it as the degree of career commitment. Almquist and Angrist (1970) considered it as the extent to which one actually planned to participate in a career. Most prolific of researchers in the area of career salience has been Greenhaus. He simply defined career salience as the importance of work.

Greenhaus (1971) developed a twenty-eight item instrument, called the Career Salience Scale (CSS), to measure this dimension. The scale consists of twenty-seven items that use a 5-point Likert-type response choice plus a ranking item that asks the respondent to prioritize six

areas of their life (family, career, religion, leisure time, local community activity, national political activity). He later factor analyzed the CSS (1973) and derived three separate dimensions for career salience. This study resulted in a more refined definition of career salience. The three derived factors were: 1) the relative priority of work, 2) general attitudes toward work, and 3) concern for career advancement and planning. A six-item short form of the CSS consists of the two items from each factor that loaded the greatest for that factor. Alpha reliability coefficients for the long and short forms are .81 and .83, respectively. He also relabelled the construct as "work salience" to depict a more accurate and encompassing term for what the CSS measures.

The CSS has been used in several studies. Greenhaus (1974) predicted that the relationship between satisfaction with an occupational preference and satisfaction with life in general would be greater for high career salient persons. He found the Concern for Career Advancement and Planning factor provided the most support for his hypothesis. A major interest has been the relationship between self-esteem and career salience. Self-esteem, conceptualized as a small discrepancy between self-concept and the ideal self-concept, has been shown to have a positive relationship with career salience and to moderate the relationship between career salience and the view of one's occupation as ideal. This

relationship was viewed as reciprocal in nature and contended that a vicious cycle could begin to emerge (Greenhaus & Simon, 1976). Comparing career salience, work values, and vocational indecision, Greenhaus and Simon (1977) found: 1) vocational indecision was high for low career salient students, 2) low and medium career salient students were more concerned with intrinsic job characteristics, and 3) that high career salient students who valued intrinsic job characteristics were more likely to be indecisive. The latter finding was explained by the possibility that those valuing intrinsic job characteristics were still in a process of self-assessment.

Career salience has been shown to have a positive relationship with vocational exploration. Locus of control did not moderate this relationship unless salience was dichotomized into extreme splits (Greenhaus & Sklarew, 1981). Greenhaus and Connolly (1982) investigated a more specific population of undergraduate business students and found additional support for the positive relationship between career salience and vocational exploration. Gender was also found to be unrelated to either variable. They concluded that it is "inappropriate to assume females in undergraduate business curricula are less interested in a career or less likely to engage in career exploration than their male counterparts" (p. 317).

The CSS was found by Thomas and Bruning (1981) to have no relationship with the Assessment of Career Decision

Making (ACDM) scale developed by Harren (an instrument designed to measure the stage of progress toward career decision making). Career decision making and career salience are considered to be independent constructs.

Sekaran defined career salience as the "extent to which one's career formed a vital part of the respondent's life" (1983, p. 292). She developed seven items to tap career salience (Sekaran, 1982), but only offered that they were "specially tested and validated for the study" and a Cronbach's alpha of .83 as a measure of internal consistency. In another study using dual-career couples (Sekaran, 1983), the career salience items along with items from fifteen other scales were factor analyzed to insure that they loaded appropriately (which they did). They were then submitted to a higher order factor analysis. Career salience became a part of the higher order factor called "the intrapsychic job dimension" which also included the variables of "self-esteem" from the job and "sense of competency." This factor structure was identical for both sexes. No significant differences were found between men and women on the factor of career salience and the higher order job dimension factor. These results are in agreement with her earlier study (1982) and she concludes, "it would seem that at least cognitively, both men and women (of dual career couples) place equal emphasis on the career and job related variables" (1983, p. 299, parentheses are added).

Salience in Other Areas

Familial, parental, or marital role salience research is virtually non-existent. It has been tangentially approached and is usually discussed in relation to career salience, if at all. For instance, Almquist and Angrist (1970) consider family role salience related to career salience, but their research is more concerned with atypicality of career choice. Greenhaus (1971) apparently seems to have included, as an afterthought, his item for prioritizing several life roles. Overall, familial, marital, or parental salience has not enjoyed the focused attention that career salience has.

There is little empirical research that measures to what extent personal preferences have changed in regards to family roles (Albrecht, Bahr, & Chadwick, 1979). The little research that has been done compares work and family salience and/or refers to it with the use of other terminology. Rossi (in Almquist & Angrist, 1970) found a negative relationship between career role salience and family role salience in a study of women college graduates. Hall and Gordon (1973) showed data that indicated the primacy of home-related activities as a factor no matter what the working status. Haavio-Mannila (1971) found the importance of the family to be greater for low status married men and women, possibly due to the small satisfaction value of low status work. Upper status men and women relied on the

family for satisfaction but other institutions were also influential. Hardesty and Betz (1980) used Greenhaus' ranking item to determine that both spouses in a sample of dual-career couples ranked the family first and their career second as a source of satisfaction.

Others have addressed salience in a more general sense. Gilbert, Holahan, and Manning (1981) considered disparate, highly salient roles as leading to role conflict. Previous choices between home and career are becoming less feasible for women. The choice is becoming more psychological in terms of commitment level and is more related to emotional attachment than to temporal involvement (Rooney, 1983; Tittle, 1982).

The Work Importance Study (WIS), an international research project spearheaded by Super, is the most elaborate effort made in conceptually and operationally defining the construct of salience. According to Super, the purpose is to "define terms scientifically so that their use in theory, in research, and in practice may be precise and thus convey clear and specific meanings" (1980A, p. 13). The salience construct consists of three basic dimensions: commitment, participation, and knowledge. Commitment is defined as the attitudinal or affective component of importance. "It is the emotional attachment to a role, . . . and to the things that one is expected to do and expects to do there" (Super, 1980A, p. 11). Participation is seen as the behavioral

component of salience because it implies action. This dimension is independent of commitment, since a person can be committed to a role without acting upon it or conversely, a person can participate in the role without being committed to it. The third dimension is called Knowledge, the cognitive component. It is considered independent of the other two, based on the idea that "attitudes and behaviors may or may not indicate knowledge and understanding" (Super, 1980A, p. 12).

Higher level factors are made up of these three basic dimensions. Role involvement is a combination of commitment and participation. Engagement is the combination of knowledge and participation, regardless of the level of commitment. Interest, on the other hand, denotes commitment and knowledge without implying participation.

The participation dimension of the WIS salience construct is similar to the style of participation dimension previously discussed (Amatea, 1983). They both are concerned with behavior, but differ in that the former is concerned with beliefs about how one should participate in the role, whereas the present perspective is concerned with the behavior a person is exhibiting at the time. Most of the sociological literature on role involvement is more consistent with the WIS conceptualization; they are concerned with actual behavior that is currently being enacted. Greenhaus and Sklarew (1981) define exploration as a proactive attempt to understand and influence one's life.

Others have focused on specific task allocation (Beeres, 1979; Kassner, 1981; Perrucci, Potter & Rhoads, 1978; Tognoli, 1979), while others have been concerned with time demands (Gilbert et al., 1981; Lein, 1979).

A product of the Work Importance Study is the Saliency Inventory (SI), authored by Super and Nevill (1983). It is designed to measure the relative importance of work and home. It measures the constructs of 1) participation, 2) commitment, and 3) values expectation in the role content areas of student, worker, citizen, homemaker, and leisurite. The commitment and values expectation scales make up the affective component of role importance and are similar in this regard, but different in the types of items they use. The participation scale uses the same format as the commitment scale, but with a different content. This makes up the behavioral component of role importance. They have been shown to be three relatively independent constructs. The SI has "gone through the psychometric processes of specification and item-writing, refinement, and purification, and has been found to be an internally consistent and stable instrument. . . ." (Nevill & Super, In Press). A more specific and extensive summary of the conducted validation studies is currently being compiled by the authors that will offer information about the technical qualities of the instrument (Nevill, 1983).

The Saliency Inventory has begun to be used in research (Nevill & Super, In Press; Super & Nevill, In Press; Super,

Mastic & Nevill, In Press). With a high school population, Super and Nevill (In Press) found career committed girls to be more career mature [using the Career Maturity Inventory, (Crites, 1978)] than males or other females. They found more males than females committed to work over home and more females than males committed to home over work (as might be expected, based on our traditional expectations). But, the two sexes were equally represented in the equally-committed-to-both category. Both sexes indicated a positive relationship between career maturity and commitment to work and home. In contrast to these results, Nevill and Super (In Press) found college males and females did not differ in their commitment to home, but females were significantly more committed to work than males. Also, both sexes had a much greater commitment to homemaking than to work. These findings suggest a complete reversal of traditional expectations. Those college students with high levels of work commitment were also found to have high scores on both career exploration and decision making, as measured by the Career Development Inventory (CDI) (Super et al., 1981).

In summary, the dimension of salience is a relatively unexplored area, especially as it relates to family and marital roles. Its relationship to other variables is unclear based on the literature reviewed. Relative comparisons between career, family, and marital role salience are lacking and inconclusive. At best, the reviewed literature suggests that career salience is not necessarily greater for

men and family role salience is not necessarily greater for women. This contrasts with what has been suggested by our traditional views of each sex.

Power Dimensions

Some investigators have explored roles from the framework of the power dimension. This has been predominately undertaken in regards to the marital relationship and has almost exclusively focused on role involvement. It has been viewed in terms of decision making processes and how these processes influences such things as task participation.

Men in our society have been influenced in the past toward assuming power and dominance in relationships. As sex role changes have taken place in the family, marriage, and workplace, we have seen a movement toward more shared responsibility by the sexes in carrying out "executive" functions. Dyer (1958) recognized this early in his contention that the "American family is in a stage of transition from the older patriarchal family to a system of democratic, equalitarian arrangement" (p. 53). His early research on family roles addressed the area of decision making as an important aspect. According to his sample of college students, the majority felt that the husband should be the "head of the household". But considering all other data, this author indicated a trend toward equality between spouses in decision making. It is the detection of a trend

that is important here. Eleven years later, the Rapoport's' (1969) pioneering work characterized dual-career couples as exhibiting collaboration in the decision making processes.

Two things become apparent here. First, power is being equated with decision making and second, we have moved from individual role expectations and preferences to a concern with relationships between people. Decision making processes as indicative of power is a popular conception. Safilios-Rothschild (1971) considers these processes as the best measure of power. Blalock and Wilken (in Scanzoni & Fox, 1980) recognize role preferences, but take this a step further by suggesting that when relationships are formed and interdependence is required, the actualization of these preferences is achieved through joint decision making processes. In short, social arrangements are a function of preferences and decisioning processes.

Scanzoni and Fox (1980) proposed that changes in sex role preferences affect family decision making in three ways. First, implicit processes are increasingly being replaced by explicitness. Our traditional arrangements in the areas of family, marriage, and work are typified by separatedness based on a person's sex. Such prescriptions were also well understood and relatively little negotiation or discussion was necessary in order for these various roles to be fulfilled. But as role preferences change and are shared by the sexes, this interchangeability requires more negotiation as to how these various roles will be carried

out. ✓ No longer is it predetermined how certain roles will be carried out and, as a result, the decision making process becomes more necessary and explicit.

Second, they saw this overlapping of interests increasing the potential for a greater range of conflicts. They contend that a shift in preferences has exceeded actual behavior change and this is because these preferences have not been accompanied by the necessary decisioning processes to translate them into reality. The sharing of preferences may increase the potential for conflict, but the lack of functional processes may result in an unwillingness to risk these conflicts with actual behavior.

Finally, they saw shifting sex-role preferences influencing the fundamental assumptions underlying how decisioning processes are carried out. For example, as the philosophy for women shifts from "if the family does well, I do too" to one of "if I do well, so does the family", this philosophy becomes the same as men's instead of being complementary. In this example, a shift of the men's sex role preferences is not merely a matter of accepting women's participation in decision making, but also accepting that she will employ the same philosophy. Scanzoni and Fox suggest that "any clash of contrasting philosophies within households is likely to undermine the likelihood of mutually satisfactory decision making" (1980, p. 746).

An instrument for measuring marital power based on the decision making perspective was developed by Blood and Wolfe

(1960). It is appropriate for married adults, but can be easily adapted for use with unmarried persons in regards to future preferences (Klecka and Hiller, 1977). It consists of eight questions about which spouse is the decision maker in particular areas. The response choice is based on a five point Likert-type scale of "husband always" to "wife always". As a summated rating scale, all items are equally weighted and a mean item score is typically derived. There are no questions related to children and therefore items selected were considered as exemplifying important situations that all couples face.

There is some difficulty in interpreting the mean score. For example, an egalitarian response to all items, or four extreme scores in one direction and four extreme scores in the other direction, would both produce an equivalent mean score of 3.00. These would be very different profiles in regards to the marital decision making.

Reliability is based on low interitem correlations (Cromwell & Wieting, 1975) and coefficients of reproductibility of .86 and .88 for husbands and wives, respectively. Additionally, a coefficient alpha of .62 was reported by Bahr (1973).

Several investigations have been conducted to determine the instrument's validity (Davis, 1971; Granbois & Willett, 1970; Turk & Bell, 1972; Wilkes, 1975). Husband and wife response correlations are very low (.15 to .35) indicating

low agreement between spouses. These studies generally concluded that the instrument possesses poor concurrent validity when compared with other measures of marital power. Using a similar format, but a different set of questions, Centers, Raven, and Rodrigues (1971) concluded that conjugal power distribution is strongly influenced by the content of the items employed. Cromwell and Wieting (1975) conducted factor analyses using five different populations and concluded that a composite mean score is unwarranted since the mean score does not represent a single variable and it is impossible to determine which factors contributed to this score. The scale has been considered as unidimensional but is in fact multi-dimensional (Beeres, 1979). In short, the psychometric properties of this instrument raise serious doubts about its utility.

Another way that marital power has been measured is in terms of resources. According to the relative resources hypothesis, husbands and wives possess a variety of power resources including education and occupational prestige (Perucci, Potter, & Rhoads, 1978). According to this perspective, the spouse who controls the relatively greater share can minimize his or her participation in undesired activities. This perspective of power was the basis for research by Ericksen, Yancey and Ericksen (1979) in which the responses of 1,212 urban couples were analyzed. Using the wife's education as a measure of her power and husband's income as a measure of his power, they suggested that

resources are strongly related to the division of labor between spouses. In relation to the other variables, (presence of children, proximity of kinship, and race) the best predictor of a husband's assistance in housework was his success as an income provider. This was a negative relationship. Wives' education was positively related to shared housework.

This research lends support to the relative resource hypothesis, but little to the understanding of the dynamic processes involved. The direction, nature, or existence of a cause and effect relationship is assumed, but not proven. For example, does a husband's income (high resource power as breadwinner) allow him in some way to not participate in undesirable tasks or does a lesser responsibility for undesirable tasks allow him to provide a higher income? Possibly, the relationship is reciprocal. At the present time, research evidence for the relative--resource hypothesis is lacking and inconclusive (Farkas, 1976; Stafford, Backman, & Dibona, 1977).

How the power dimension relates to role involvement has been considered. Neither the "decision-making" or "relative resource" perspectives of power are exhaustively researched. It seems the decision-making perspective is more conceptually sophisticated and offers the greatest potential for understanding the relationship between power and role behavior.

Role Conflict

A major area of investigation has been the area of role conflict and role ambiguity. This has been partially generated by an interest in women as they have invested themselves in other areas outside of the home. Therefore, the majority of investigations have been in regards to women's concerns. At least this was true initially, but this focus has come to include men to some degree. A change in women's roles undoubtedly affects men (Harrison, 1978).

The occurrence of conflict between roles has typically been conceptualized in terms of time demands (Lein, 1979). A broader view is that role conflict emerges when there are simultaneous needs to meet the demands of disparate and highly salient roles (Gilbert, Holahan, & Manning, 1981; Holahan & Gilbert, 1979). This perspective refers not only to the demands of actual behavior, but also allows for the fact that role demands require internal processes.

Role conflict has been defined as the incongruity of expectations associated with a role. Role ambiguity is differentiated as the degree to which clear information is lacking about a) expectations, b) methods for fulfilling expectations, and c) consequences of role performance (Van Sell et al., 1981). In discussing the development of individual perceptions, Yockey (1978) stated that the person who internalizes ambiguous standards will likely experience conflict. Rapoport and Rapoport (1969), in their pioneering work of dual career couples, refer to the following dilemmas

as the dimensions of stress: 1) Overload dilemmas--physical and psychological distress resulting from the sheer quantity of responsibilities on individual faces; 2) Dilemmas arising from the discrepancy between personal norms and social norms; 3) Dilemmas of identity--stress arising from one's sexual identity; 4) Social network dilemmas--because of heavy demands this is the inability to develop strong relations with friends and family; and 5) Role-cycling dilemmas--matching the fluctuating demands of life roles as problematic. This latter dilemma addresses the temporally unstable nature of role conflict (Richardson, 1981).

Role conflict research on women has greatly emphasized the home versus career arenas (Hath, 1973). Navin (1972) considered this as the simultaneous pressure for women to achieve success in a career and to be a good homemakers and mothers with both affecting the other and increasing the likelihood of both being impeded. She considered this to be especially true for college women since they tend to be more career oriented. Johnson and Johnson (1977) investigated the aspect of parenting with 28 dual career couples and reported that the wives still retained major responsibility for child-rearing and had major concerns in regards to combining career and children. The authors concluded that the result of this dual responsibility was role strain characterized by guilt and fatigue.

Whereas there is an underlying attitude that women's work involvement should not jeopardize the family, Berger

(1979) considered this relationship to be reversed for men--family investments should not intrude upon the work space. He states that "men who create new family roles will increasingly find themselves meeting resistance or opposition from colleagues and from institutional procedures at work" (p. 639). Some investigations (Pleck, 1977; O'Neil, 1981) have noted that men are met with hostility when family responsibilities interfere with work. Rosen, Jerdee, and Prestwich (1975) have demonstrated employer resistance to promoting males who heavily invest themselves in their families. Internalizations of these outside expectations leave men often ambivalent about their roles within the family (Berger, 1979).

So far, role conflict has been discussed in terms of the individual. Another research concern has been how this role conflict affects the marital relationship. This is primarily an interpersonal concern. This is reflected in the contention that as women's roles change, men will need to be change or tension or conflict will occur between them (Kamerman, 1979).

Scanzoni and Fox (1980) suggested that conflicts arise in marriages when decisioning processes necessary to carry out changing role preferences are lacking or not well developed. Because of this, as interests of spouses increasingly overlap, conflicts between them will increase. According to them, the marital dyad is the place in which people will experience their maximum conflict.

Distressed couples (those seeking therapy) and non-distressed couples were compared (Frank, Anderson, and Rubenstein, 1980) and it was found that these distressed couples had a significantly greater degree of role strain. These couples expressed a greater degree of measured discrepancy between their ideals and their perception of actual behavior. In their investigation of dual career couples, Holahan and Gilbert (1979) hypothesized that high career commitment, high spouse support, and profeminist attitudes toward the roles of women would be associated with lower interrole conflict for women. Although the major concern is with wives and the sample is small and likely atypical, there were implications for ingredients of a successful relationship. Both men and women reported high levels of career commitment and were very profeminist. Spouses rated each other high on emotional support for career pursuits with no significant differences between men and women. It seems the mutually supportive relationship may be related to a lesser degree of role conflict. Beutell and Greenhaus (1982) similarly found that women with levels of career salience equal to their husbands experienced less intense conflict (the determining factor here was similarity, not the actual level of salience). This was suggested as being due to a mutual understanding of each other's aspirations, values, and concerns.

Richardson (1981) considered the research on the conflict between family and work roles as slight and

rudimentary. She contended that an accumulation of studies without an over-arching theoretical orientation contributes little to understanding role conflict in a meaningful way. Two general suggestions were offered for future research. First, research must focus on more than just the relationship between certain variables and role conflict. She suggests that a better understanding of the environmental context which supports such relationships is needed. Second, current research is criticized for conveying a false impression of stability over time in regards to the process of combining roles. In reality this process involves many alterations over time. The experience of conflict changes, for example, as children are born and they grow up. Therefore, it is suggested that "we need to study individuals at many points in the process of combining roles, recognizing that analysis, . . . , involves arbitrarily breaking into a historically based and circularly interacting system of influences" (Richardson, 1981, p. 19). A consideration of current history is especially important in light of recent changes in role expectations for adults.

Role Interaction

Role conflict research is conceptually a concern for the interaction of roles; in this case the interaction between career, family and marital roles. This has not always been true. An emphasis on either the work arena or the home arena can be traced historically (Skovholt &

Morgan, 1981). Women and men are increasingly being encouraged to enter less traditional domains. This is due to a variety of influences, such as the women's liberation movement, the civil rights movement, and economic conditions. Tittle (1983) considers the major salient roles for women to be those of worker, marriage partner, and parent. Therefore, separate considerations of work and home are no longer tenable (Blaska, 1978; Kamerman, 1979).

Several writers have criticized current career choice theories as inadequate for examining the career related decisions of women (Almquist & Angrist, 1970; Fitzgerald & Crites, 1979; Tittle, 1982). Others contend that career guidance has mostly been a matter of measuring and interpreting occupational interest patterns (Munley, Fretz, & Mills, 1973; Whitney, 1969). Such writers suggest that future theories should consider career as a part of one's total life and takes other life roles into account. There is a connectedness between work and family (Berger, 1979; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1969).

Hayes (1969) felt that work affects the whole style of life. Yet this contention does not recognize the reciprocal nature of the relationship between work, family, and marriage. It implies work is the most important aspect of one's life. Others have viewed this as a difficulty:

Expectations for work and career are not considered separate or apart from other aspects of the individual's life. Work is considered an essential part of living, but not the most significant or critical element. Individual and familial relationships, according to most respondents are

not to be sacrificed for occupational success or mobility; rather work and family are expected to blend together in some meaningful and satisfying manner. (Gottlieb, 1975, p. 124)

Richardson (1979) took issue with seeing the career as the central focus when we consider childbirth to be a "disruption" to a career. She feels this gives childbirth a negative connotation. She considered the separatedness of life roles as a false myth and that role interaction is a much more complex matter than previously believed. Simply looking at linear causality in relationships is too simplistic an approach. The concept of reciprocity more effectively represents the complexity of the interactive nature of the role system and "provides a logical process for delineating levels of analysis" (1981, p. 15). Using this framework of reciprocity, one can consider not only how work affects parenthood and marriage, but how it is also affected by them.

This broader perspective is reflected in Super's conceptualization of "career." Super (1957) defined career "as a sequence of positions held during the course of a lifetime, some of them simultaneously." Super (1980) further elaborated that there are nine roles in which people become involved at some point in life (child, student, leisurite, citizen, worker, spouse, homemaker, parent, pensioner). These roles are played out in the four principal theaters of home, community, school, and workplace. At any point in time, the particular combination of life roles are referred to by Super as the lifestyle. The sequential

combination of these roles structure the life space. In its entirety, the structure is referred to as the career pattern. Developmentally, Super considered the decision points in some roles as closely tied to decision points of other roles. Within this one sees the mutual causality aspect of his theory as well as a broader concept of career. Richardson (1979) saw Super's definition of career as more closely matched to the realities of women's lives (although Super does not see his nine role categories and four principal theaters as sex-linked unless they are defined more precisely). The developmental aspect of Super's theory will be elaborated in a later section of this review.

Instruments that consider multiple roles are few and have only recently been developed. In Beeres' (1979) review of twenty "multiple role" instruments usable for women, fifteen were developed during the seventies and none were developed prior to 1963. For those with an interest in multiple contexts, few scales exist (Brogan & Kutner, 1976). The previously mentioned Salience Inventory (Super and Nevill, 1983) exemplifies a response to the need for a multicontextual approach in measuring life roles.

Many different research possibilities unfold from this multicontextual framework (Safilios-Rothschild, 1971). Birk (1974) called research on the home versus career conflict a "broadening exploration." Van Sell and her associates (1981) suggested analyzing inconsistencies or ambiguities

among role expectations. In terms of career planning, Hayes (1969) suggested that:

The purpose of occupational information is to provide the individual with the means of assessing whether a work role and its associated non-work roles are in harmony with the kinds of role he would like to play and the way of life he aspires to. (p. 18)

Carol Tittle (1983) suggested that:

. . . variables and outcomes considered in career decision making theory, in studies of the effects of career guidance interventions, and more specifically, in studies of effects of career interest measures, must be expanded . . . plans and timing of education, work, marriage, children, . . ., all require specification and examination in relation to each other. (pp. 148-149)

It seems the essence of the reviewed literature in this section is the suggestion to adopt an expanded view of people and their roles. Our investigative interests would be greatly enhanced by not narrowly viewing the person as only an employee, spouse, parent, or student. To only consider these roles in isolation avoids the interactional aspect and lessens our understanding of the life experience.

Developmental Perspectives

A recent approach to conceptualizing work and family roles has been the developmental perspective. In his historical examination of how we have considered sex roles, Harrison (1978) considered the developmental perspective as a recent example of "paradigm transformation." He claimed that "most psychological theories do not account for the stages of

development beyond the achievement of childhood" (p. 333). Robinson and Green (1981) defined the structural--developmental perspective as viewing systems organized along the principles of adoptive regulation. This is in opposition to early sex role theory that assumed fixedness. This early approach is analogous to viewing one frame of a film whereas the developmentalist would be interested in the entire movie.

What will first be considered in this section are the Stage theory and the Life Events theory as developmental perspectives of life roles. The discussion will then turn to more specific developmental aspects of these roles.

Stage Theory

Theories based on developmental stages assume regularly occurring growth and change processes that apply to people in general. The shift from one stage to another implies basic qualitative changes in the person's life experience and that change is both discontinuous and ordered (Richardson, 1981). In regards to family roles, shifts from one stage to another involve definite alterations in positions and roles within the family structure (Alpert, 1981).

In developmental stage theories, a concept often referred to is the developmental task. A developmental task is "a set of norms (role expectations) arising at a particular point in the career of a position in a social system, which, . . . , brings about integration and temporary

equilibrium in the system with regard to a role complex . . ." (Hill & Rodgers, in Magrabi & Marshall, 1965, p. 455). Summarizing Ericksonian theory, Rossi (1980) stated that each developmental task had a special time for ascending and if the task appropriate for a particular stage is not completed, development in subsequent stages will be impaired. She labelled the stage theory of development as the Normative-Crisis Model. Crises are seen as critical and necessary for movement into a new stage. Resolution of this crisis produces significant change in the individual.

Life Events Theory

In the Life Events model of development, roles are considered in more mechanistic terms. The essential nature of this model focuses on antecedent-consequent relations, where causes are identified and an individual's reaction to the cause can be analyzed. Change in this model is considered continuous and relative to the person and situation. It does not occur in stages and is not universal (Richardson, 1981). The actual events are influenced by antecedent, mediating, and consequent factors. Antecedent factors are various aspects that occur before or after the event. Mediating factors are the biological, psychological, and contextual factors that influence the individual's perception and response to the event. Consequent factors are the individual responses to an event. The interaction between these three factors is the focus of the life events model

(Alpert, 1981). This model emphasizes that there is no overarching ground plan to a person's development and therefore, chronological age is not a meaningful determinant (Rossi, 1980). In referring to middle-aged men and women, Neugarten (1969) agreed with this point. She suggested this group looks toward their positions within different contexts (career, family), not chronological age, for cues in timing themselves. She did not see developmental psychology concerned with crises but with the timing of events.

Criticisms of Stage and Life Events Models

Developmental stage theory has been criticized in three ways (Alpert, 1981). First, it is considered to place too much emphasis on age as a determinant of change. Critics argue that the joint impact of age-graded, history-- graded, and non-normative events are influential. Second, stage theory assumes an orderly, unidirectional, and irreversible sequence that is age related and growth oriented. Critics claim that development may be linear, multilinear, continuous and discontinuous; that stage theory is too simplistic. Third, stage theory is criticized for its assumption of universality. Critics claim that people experience different historical events at different points in the life cycle and that the impact may vary depending upon the social context and coping abilities of the groups and individuals involved. Others have questioned universality by showing that men's and women's role patterns differ and theories

developed on the basis of men's lives are not applicable to women (Richardson, 1981; Rossi, 1980). For example, women's employment rates have been shown to vary with the life stage they are in (Taeuber & Sweet, 1976).

Rossi (1980) criticized the life events perspective for not dealing with cohort differences over time. She felt most of the "research about middle age has therefore come from people who were either born during the depression or spent their early childhood in families which experienced it" (p. 14). Alpert (1981) criticized the life events approach for not helping in understanding the developmental process. She claimed it does not enable the identification of regularities.

Both approaches have been criticized for ignoring biological variables (Rossi, 1980). They are recognized, but the interplay between biological and social or psychological factors has not been explored. For example, Rossi hypothesized that underlying the shift to more agentic behavior by females from midlife on could be the change in the androgen/estrogen hormone ratio. This is a time when androgen is more active and influential due to the drop in estrogen levels. She also suggested that as men's androgen levels drop, a reversed pattern may have an affiliative effect.

In summary, the stage and life events models of development differ in three general ways. First, there is a difference with respect to the focus of change. Stage

theory primarily stresses internal stimulus whereas life events theory sees change as a response to alterations in the environment. Second, stage theory and life events theory differ in their conception of whether development is discontinuous or continuous. Third, stage theory assumes universality in development whereas the life events model emphasizes individual differences. With the preceding delineation of the two general approaches in mind, the focus of this review will move to more specific considerations of the developmental perspective as it applies to the contexts of work, marriage, and family.

Magrabi and Marshall (1965) proposed an early model of family developmental tasks. They proposed two subsystems: the situational sequence and tasks sequence. The situational sequence suggests that within each stage, many specific family situations are possible. Depending on the different situations faced in one stage, other possibilities arise in subsequent stages. In short, they propose a stage model with enough flexibility to account for several possibilities. The task sequence accounts for variations in the level at which developmental tasks are accomplished. For example, there are many different levels at which a family may be maintained physically, some more comfortable than others. These two subsystems are linked by "situational imperatives." These are similar to the previously mentioned "crisis points" (Rossi, 1980) or "decision points" (Super, 1980).

Feldman and Feldman (1975) made a distinction between the lineage family and the lifetime family. The lineage family covers several generations and is considered a macroanalytical unit of investigation. Only the macro unit is considered appropriate for examining the family life cycle; the relationship between the family as a social institution and other social institutions. The time frame of this macroanalytic unit is referred to as "historical time." The lifetime family is concerned with one family and is a microanalytical unit. They considered the term "career" as more applicable in this case. The microanalytical time frame for analysis is "developmental time." Four subcareers subsumed in the lifetime family are suggested as modules. These modules are the sexual experience career, marital career, parental career, and adult-parent career (this final career referring to a concern with the relationship between a parent and their adult offspring). The modules can be joined or separated within the lifespan of the individual being considered. It is the transition points of entering or leaving these subcareers that are referred to as "crisis" points in family studies.

Sex role transcendence theory (previously discussed) is essentially a developmental stage theory that addresses sex roles. Three general stages of sex role development (undifferentiated, polarized, transcendence) have been proposed (Hefner et al., 1975; Rebecca et al., 1976). Initially, a child learns to order and organize very diffuse information

by polarizing this information into a dichotomy of appropriate male and female role behavior. This is seen as a necessary and healthy step for the child's psychological well being and the process is greatly influenced by parents, peers, and others. If sex role development completes itself, the person will eventually progress (through various processes) to a point in which gender becomes a less relevant determinant of behavior. Situational demands will become a more important determinant of behavior (transcendence). Movement from one stage to another is generally induced by crises, the resolution of which produces a higher level of conceptualization. The problem (according to this theory) is the polarizing style receives greater support in our culture than does the transcendent style. Therefore, most people do not move beyond this stage of development.

The above perspective stems from Block's (1973) work, which imbedded the development of sex role definition in the larger context of ego development, and from Pleck (1975) who proposed three stages analogous to Kohlberg's theory of moral development. Although Hefner and associates (1975) considered their developmental perspective to be a stage model, they saw it differing from the work of Kohlberg and Piaget. They were particularly interested in the dynamics of the transition between stages (as opposed to a static description of an unchanging stage).

Super has drawn upon the developmental perspective in formulating his theories on careers. His very definition of

"career" as a sequence of positions held during the course of a lifetime (Super, 1957), exhibited such a perspective. He used the term to encompass several role content areas and distinguished this from "occupation" (Super, 1980). This career development theory was not offered as a sex role theory. He made no sex-linked distinctions regarding roles, but was concerned with several arenas in which people participate. In short, he was concerned with the broader view of career in terms of content, time dimensions, and how this perspective was applicable to anyone.

The "life span, life space approach" to careers (Super, 1980) is a stage theory model and like other stage theories, referred to the concept of developmental tasks. In line with this general perspective, he considered the degree of adequacy with which different tasks were accomplished as influencing success and satisfaction in subsequent roles.

Super (1980, 1983) discussed the construct of role salience from a developmental viewpoint. He noted that "roles increase and decrease in importance with the life stage in which a person finds himself, according to the developmental tasks which are encountered with increasing age" (p. 288). The degree of importance was seen in terms of both time and emotion. Fluctuations in role importance are marked by decision points which occur before or at the time of taking on new roles, when giving up old roles, or when making changes in the nature of an existing role.

Super's (1980) model of career guidance is also developmental in nature. The time component of his model calls for past reflection and future anticipation. Coping with anticipated developmental tasks requires foresight. It is important for people to see themselves as "individuals coping with certain developmental tasks, at a stage in life at which they are expected, and to some degree may expect themselves, to make certain decisions and acquire certain competencies and statuses" (p. 559). Information about the world of work, a cognitive factor, should additionally include ways of coping with these developmental tasks.

In regards to research, some have suggested a middle range exploration of developmental perspectives (Feldman & Feldman, 1975; Magrabi & Marshall, 1965; Rodgers, 1965). This would mean addressing shorter time intervals that encompass the period before and after a life transition (such as the birth of a baby, a new job, divorce). The expense and commitment necessary to do longitudinal research has undoubtedly lent itself to developmental conceptions of life roles that lack empirical support. It would seem that whether one is concerned with role salience, role expectations, or career and family contexts, a greater understanding of how they develop, change, and fluctuate over time might be attained with a developmental perspective.

Measurement Problems

Like other content areas of investigative interest, life roles research is hindered by methodological and instrumentation problems. Some of these problems will be discussed in the following section.

A major difficulty in the area of life role research is the disproportionate amount of attention paid to women's issues. Komarovsky (1973) has noted the female bias in life role research. The empirical research on men is limited. Only recently have researchers begun to examine expectations placed on men by virtue of being male (O'Neil, 1981). Measurement scales in the area of life roles have also tended to exclude males (Beeres, 1979; Brogan & Kutner, 1976). Many instruments purported to consider or compare male and female issues, expectations, and attitudes, are in actuality more focused on the role concerns of women. For example, although Brogan and Kutner (1976) recognized that males are excluded in measurement scales, the development of their Sex Role Orientation Scale provides us with a contradiction. Item selection was based on female to male sample ratio of 2 to 1. They then took a subsample and related the scale scores to certain demographic data. Because this subsample lacked enough males (12), they only analyzed the female respondents.

As another example, Angrist, Mickelson, and Penna (1977) developed a nine item scale (each item loading greater than .40 on the principal component of sex-role

ideology) and administered it to 529 adolescents, grades nine through twelve. The findings showed males to be more "sexist" than females. Yet close examination of the items shows that six of the nine items are predominately focused on female issues. Based on the responses to a five-point Likert-type scale of "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree," it may be a false assumption that these males are more sexist. Consider for example, the item stating that "a wife should work only if there is a definite economic need." A male may "disagree" with this statement, but not with the vehemence of a female. Since it is more personally related to her, she may respond with "strongly disagree." Therefore, a male who disagrees still receives a higher score and is considered more sexist. It is unlikely that males could score in more of a non-traditional fashion or at an equal level with females.

Sexism in the development of role instruments is not solely to the disadvantage of the male sex. Straus and Brown (1978) indicated that many of the family measurement techniques reflected the sexist structure of our society. The measures of household task performance "assume that most of these tasks are the province of women and paid employment is the province of men" (p. 7). As an example, one instrument was found to count as an indicator of "joint" participation if the husband "sometimes" cooks and "rarely" does laundry. Items were also found to sometimes depict stereotyped situations ("You come home to dinner table as your

wife begins to serve chicken . . ."). Beeres (1979) in her review of instruments dealing with employee roles, called attention to the items which provided the measurement with a built-in bias. Some considered whether or not women should work on a continuum from "women should not work" to "women have a right to work," instead of stating the latter as "women should work." Another example is the abundance of items related to employee roles that suggested women might be inferior or equal to men; few items suggested women may be superior. This is a situation that assumed male employee behavior sets the optimal standard. Straus and Brown (1978) suggested it is bad science to build an ideology into a measure:

What is needed are measures which do not assume either a sexist or an egalitarian family system, measures which allow for the tremendous range of variation existing in all societies, and measures which are capable of producing data unbiased by either the existing ideology or by ideology concerning alternative modes of social relationships. (p. 8)

During the 1970's there has been a major increase in sex role research, but studies appear to be comprised of isolated empirical generalizations, however. In addition, the significance of sex role has still been undetermined (Scanzoni & Fox, 1980). One possible reason for this is the lack of comparability in studies.

Beeres (1979) saw problems with terminology and definition of terms contributing to the lack of comparability. Ambiguous definitions between instruments and the lack of

definitions in others are one source of the problem. Some instruments differentiate a construct (such as "role ideology") into more specific constructs (such as "role adaptation," "role preference," and role orientation/identity") whereas others do not.

Comparability by research repetition is also difficult because information on the properties of instruments is either scattered or unavailable. Some investigations adopt easily accessible instruments without clearly assessing their merits or appropriateness (Lake, Miles, & Earle, in Cromwell, Olsen, & Fournier, 1976).

According to Cromwell and his associates (1976), social science measurement tools fair poorly in comparison to the more natural sciences. Straus (1964) agreed with this but claimed the problem is primitive measurement technology rather than conceptualization. Longitudinal and empirical research for the development of an instrument is rare. Instruments that are simple and available are used. The reliable and valid are not (Lake et al., in Cromwell et al., 1976). The reliability and validity of a great number of role assessment instruments is either poorly established, left unreported, or is completely lacking (Beeres, 1979; Straus & Brown, 1978; Van Sell et al., 1981).

An example of poor instrument development is the Marriage Role Expectation Inventory, authored by Marie S. Dunn. The Teacher's and Counselor's Manual (1979) reported validation to be a process by which the original pool of

items were developed by soliciting unstructured responses from adolescents concerning role expectations. These responses were then subjected to formulation and editing by the author. The original edition selected final items able to distinguish between low and high scoring groups with a .05 level of confidence. In the revised edition, items eliminated by this process were replaced by soliciting more unstructured responses and relying upon professional material (with no subsequent statistical analysis being conducted on these replacement items). Items were also placed into different categories based solely on the author's and other professionals' judgments. A split-half reliability coefficient was computed for the original inventory, but reliability data for the revised edition was not established. It should be emphasized that this is not an instrument offered for research purposes only pending further development. It has been published and marketed for general professional use.

Another problem that contributes to misuse of instrumentation is the application of measures to populations other than those with which validity and reliability were established. Differences can emerge in the factor structure of an instrument as a function of sex, age, amount of education, socioeconomic level, and type of school curricula (Cromwell & Wieting, 1975; Anastasia, 1981). Therefore, the use and interpretation of subscale scores for an inappropriate population is potentially misleading. Beeres (1979)

addressed this as a problem in dimensionality. Separate factor analyses on different groups of people often produce ambiguous results, thereby concluding different factors are needed to explain group differences in variability. She saw this as a far better situation than assuming that an instrument is unidimensional, or that the same factors apply to all groups. Therefore, she recommended "factor analytic studies be conducted for groups similar to those with which the instrument will be used" (p. 15).

College Students and Life Roles

The essence of a college education is the exchange of and exposure to a variety of ideas and information. Those things learned in one's family and community of origin are either supported or challenged by this exposure. But ideas about what are appropriate role behaviors are not necessarily synonymous with the actual behavior enacted by a person. Ideas influence behavior, but a change in preferences will exceed a change of behavior (Scanzoni & Fox, 1980).

Strong (1978) claimed that traditional values are eroded by the collegiate experience. The exposure to new and varied ideas influence "upper division students to be more willing to participate in alternatives which incorporate less traditional sex role behaviors than lower division students" (p. 501). The findings of Keller, Maxwell, and Ritzert (1978) suggested quite the contrary. In regards to marital role expectations, they found such a

comparison between college freshmen and seniors not yielding any significant differences. The academic discipline of the student has been shown as a factor in regards to holding liberal or conservative views, although the causal relationship is unclear (Stein and Weston, 1976).

Other studies have sought to investigate the differences between college males and females, in regards to life roles. Osmond and Martin (1975) found that males gave significantly more traditional responses on 72% of the items presented to college juniors and seniors. Also, both sexes responded most traditionally to items that referred to the familial role. Contrary to this, other studies with high school adolescents have shown males and females perceived themselves as equally responsible for childcare and males significantly endorsed this more than females endorsed equally sharing financial responsibility (Farmer, 1983; Tittle, 1981).

It is questionable whether or not we can compare high school and college students. But if we consider this difference alone we could only assume from the preceding studies, that college life does not have a liberalizing effect. The fact of the matter is that methodological and comparability problems make it difficult to ascertain which gender or educational group holds more or less liberal attitudes toward career, marital, and parental roles.

In considering an undergraduate college population, the general concern is with young adults who have yet to fully

implement their career, marital, and parental roles. Therefore, the concern is with their expectations of these future roles. Students who espouse liberal attitudes may, in real situations, behave more traditionally (Gilbert, Deutsch, & Strahan, 1978; Komarovsky, 1973; Voss, 1980) although, as developmental theory suggests, such ideas may influence later behavior.

Young adults generally expect to be involved in several roles. In a survey of 1200 adolescents, Aneshensel and Rosen (1980) found that 84% of the females expected to be involved in work and have a family. Another study of 140 freshman undergraduate women found that 90% planned to marry, 93% planned to have careers, and that 85% planned to have children (Doherty & Schmidt, 1978). Blaska (1978) claimed that a women's expectations of a career or work influence the postponement of marriage. Bernard (1971) and Tavris (1976) considered a prominent issue for young women to be the nature of their occupational and domestic role combination. In regards to college men, Katz (1978) found that 75% expected to share equally in childcare and child-rearing. In another study on college males, 91% wanted a wife with a career, 60% felt mothers and fathers should spend equal time with their children, and 44% felt that household responsibilities should be shared with both husband and wife contributing equally to family responsibilities (Lozoff, 1981).

These studies suggest that the expectations of college students are in line with more modernistic trends, but the latter study offers some additional insight. Apparently there are some college males who endorse their wife working in a career, but are less willing to contribute to home and family responsibilities. Whether one sees this as an unwillingness or as an inability on the male's part, such a situation possesses the potential for conflict. Since this is current data on the expectations of young men, one has to consider the likelihood that such a potential will continue to exist in the future.

Summary and Implications

This review of the literature has attempted to provide an overall view of how life roles have been and are currently being conceptualized in the psychological, sociological, and developmental literature. Although there is a historical element here, the viewpoints reviewed are current ones. It was not the reviewer's intention to examine very early writings and discarded conceptualizations. The investigators and theorists cited are current ones, although some work with and formulate theory based on ideas that have been around for a long time. Others have rejected such notions and are embarking upon new theories and unexplored areas. It is recognized that an ultimate reality has not been found regarding life roles. Yet this literature review

suggests several key ideas for investigating life roles.

These are as follows:

- 1) There is a great deal of variability in role behavior from one situation to another and there is a need for a better understanding of the environmental context in which role attitudes and behaviors are expressed.
- 2) General stereotypes of males and females are difficult to determine in our culture. Because of recent changes in our society, sex appropriate role behavior and attitudes are typified by greater flexibility and divergence. Instruments and research will need to be designed to assess a broader range of possible role behavior and/or attitudes.
- 3) Assumptions about the importance and priority given to life roles (e.g. work, family) may be inappropriate. Research and instrumentation needs to be able to account for individual differences.
- 4) We cannot assume that expressed role attitudes and behaviors are stable over time. Researchers need to examine/explain findings within a developmental framework. Research on the developmental process is also suggested.
- 5) All life roles need to be considered in relation to one another. Even research that specifically focuses on a single role arena needs to consider how the findings fit into the broader perspective.

6) Because of the disproportionate number of studies done on female roles/issues and the fact that changes in women's roles necessitate a change in those of men, more research is needed that focuses on and/or includes male roles.

7) Since there is a need for research to be replicable, comparability can be aided by using the same construct definitions. Since definitions vary this would be a more useful approach than simply using a similar construct name.

8) There is a need for instrumentation that has been demonstrated to be empirically valid and reliable.

9) Research findings and instrumentation validation done with one population should be restricted to that population.

This review attempted to consider the diverse ways in which we currently consider life roles; from those ideas that are more common to those in which new ground is being broken. Although no one of these diverse conceptualizations may explain reality more adequately than another, each approach provides a different way of viewing reality and has something to offer in explaining life roles.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The Life Role Expectations Scales (LRE Scales) were developed by Amatea and Cross (1983) for the purpose of obtaining information about a person's beliefs and expectations regarding the three major life roles of worker, marriage partner, and parent. This study was designed to assess the validity and reliability of the LRE Scales. The question of validity was addressed by examining the factor structure of the LRE Scales. Reliability was examined by collecting information about the internal consistency and temporal stability of the instrument. A university student population was used for this study.

In this chapter the general research questions addressed in the study are discussed and the current form of the instrument is described. In addition, sample selection procedures and a description of the sample, data collection and recording procedures, data analysis procedures, and methodological assumptions and limitations are presented.

Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed for a university undergraduate student population

- 1) What is the factor structure underlying the LRE Scales?
- 2) Do the derived factors support the proposed constructs of the LRE Scales?
- 3) Are the LRE Scales internally consistent?
- 4) Are the LRE Scales stable over time?

Instrumentation

Two instruments were used in this study: (1) the Life Role Expectations Scales and (2) a demographic data sheet.

Life Role Expectations Scales (LRE Scales)

The LRE Scales (Appendix A) are intended to measure the two theoretical constructs of role reward value and level of role participation in regards to personal expectations for the occupational, marital, and parental arenas. Role reward value is defined as the extent to which rewards accruing from role membership are valued and viewed as a major source of self definition and expression. The Level of role participation is defined as the extent to which an individual takes responsibility for and an active role in the development, implementation, expansion, and management of role activities. The occupational role refers to those work/job tasks for which an individual receives some compensation. The marital role consists of those tasks and functions related to the affective and material maintenance

of a marriage. The parental role consists of those functions performed in the rearing and maintenance of children (Amatea & Cross, 1983).

The LRE Scales are composed of six theoretical scales: 1) the occupational role reward value scale, 2) the marital role reward value scale, 3) the parental role reward value scale, 4) the level of occupational role participation scale, 5) the level of marital role participation scale, and 6) the level of parental role participation scale. The LRE Scales were designed to be used with populations that are or are not involved in these three life roles. The respondent is instructed to express their current ideas about these roles. Therefore, the LRE Scales are generally expected to be appropriate for populations of various ages. The same form of the LRE Scales is designed for use with both males and females. The lack of sex-biased item wording makes the form's content appropriate for use with either sex.

The six LRE Scales consist of ten items each, resulting in a total of sixty items (see Table 1). Items from each scale are interspersed throughout the entire instrument so as to not indicate an apparent subgrouping of items to the respondent.

A person is asked to respond to each item in terms of a five point Likert-type response choice of (1) Disagree, (2) Mostly Disagree, (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree, (4) Mostly Agree, (5) Agree. Twenty of the items are reverse scored (the reversed items are underlined in

Table 1
The Life Role Expectations Scales

Scale	Item Number ^a
Occupational Role Reward Value	1, 8, <u>10</u> , 18, <u>22</u> , <u>27</u> , 34, 45, <u>48</u> , 56
Marital Role Reward Value	<u>3</u> , 15, 21, 26, <u>31</u> , <u>33</u> , 38, 41, <u>49</u> 57
Parental Role Reward Value	6, 12, 16, 29, 32, <u>42</u> , <u>44</u> , 47, <u>53</u> , 58
Level Of Occupational Role Par- ticipation	4, <u>13</u> , 24, 30, 36, 46, 52, <u>54</u> 59, <u>60</u>
Level Of Marital Role Participation	5, 9, <u>14</u> , 19, <u>20</u> , 25, <u>40</u> , 50, 51, 55
Level Of Parental Role Participation	2, 7, 11, <u>17</u> , 23, <u>28</u> , 35, <u>37</u> , 39, 43

^aUnderlined items are reversed scored.

Table 1). A higher score for an item is associated with a greater degree of role reward value or role participation; a lower score is associated with a lesser degree of role reward value or role participation.

The LRE Scales were originally developed as the Life Role Inventory by Amatea and Cross in 1981, and consisted of 78 items. Each of these original items were theorized to belong to one of six scales: Career role structure, family role structure, marital role structure, career achievement, family achievement, and marital achievement. Role structure

was considered on a continuum from egalitarian to traditional and achievement was considered on a continuum from high to low achievement needs, with both of these considered in the contexts of career, family, and marriage. Items were worded so as to be appropriate for either persons currently performing any of these roles or for persons not currently in these roles. The response choice consisted of a 4 point Likert-type scale of strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree, the intention being to force an individual to choose a favorable or unfavorable response to the item.

These 78 items were administered to university undergraduates ranging in age from 17 to 25. This sample consisted of 70 males and 41 females. An item analysis was performed to determine the frequency of responses chosen for each item. To assess the composition of each scale, item-to-total score correlation coefficients were computed on each item.

Those items which demonstrated an insufficient spread on the frequency distribution or had an item-to-total score correlation coefficient of less than .50 were eliminated. The remaining items were reanalyzed for content and the scales were redefined as role reward value and level of role participation in the occupational, family, and marital life arenas. New items were also developed and added to the item pool. The response choice was changed from a four point Likert scale to a five point Likert scale. Some items were

also reworded. The sixty item version of the LRE Scales investigated in this study incorporated these modifications.

Demographic Data Sheet

A demographic data sheet was developed by the researcher in order to obtain information about the sample obtained for this research (see Appendix B). Information regarding sex, age, current employment status, academic class, and number of children was requested for the purposes of screening eligible respondents and defining the sample population. Information on a subject's race and present or intended major was also requested to further define the sample population.

Sample

Four hundred and thirty-four subjects participated in this study. The selection procedures used for obtaining subjects and the nature of the resulting sample are described below.

Selection of Subjects

Only those subjects who were university undergraduates, had never been married, had no children, were not full-time employees, and were between 17 and 25 years of age were considered for use in this study. It was proposed that the sample representative of a variety of university majors and

class levels with no major represented by more than forty percent (40%) of the sample or class level (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) represented by less than twenty percent (20%) of the sample. A minimum of 400 subjects consisting of at least 200 females and 200 males was also considered a necessary requirement.

A major source for obtaining subjects for this study was the Department of Psychology's subject pool at the University of Florida. Subjects in the pool were required to complete 5 hours of participation in psychological research as part of the Introductory Psychology course requirements. This was considered an appropriate source of subjects because of the utilization of this course by many students to fulfill either the general education, major, or elective requirements of several academic disciplines. Sign-up sheets were posted on the experiment sign-up board. A brief description of the research, and information regarding several group administration times and locations was provided. The researcher's name and phone number were also made available.

A limitation to using the psychology subject pool as a source of subjects was that the majority of students were expected to be freshmen and sophomores. In order to obtain additional upper division students, the instructors of several junior and senior level courses were contacted. The number and type of courses contacted was determined by class size and their potential for satisfying the proposed makeup

of the sample population. Instructors were asked to allow approximately 35 minutes of class time for a group administration of the instrument packet.

By virtue of the information provided during the solicitation of subjects, it was felt that the great majority of subjects would meet the conditions necessary for inclusion in the study. The demographic data sheet provided additional verification.

Of the total sample of students obtained from the psychology subject pool, a subgroup of 59 subjects were solicited for the purpose of investigating temporal stability of the LRE Scales. These subjects were asked to sign up for two administrations of the instrument two weeks apart in duration. In order to obtain an approximately equal number of subjects from each sex group, an equal number of male only and female only groups were posted for the same two-week period.

Group sizes for test administration were varied and depended largely upon the size of the facilities available or the specific courses used for administration. Group sizes ranged from a group of six to a group of seventy-three respondents.

Description of Subjects

Due to the procedure for soliciting subjects, the vast majority of respondents satisfied the necessary criterion for inclusion in the final sample. The demographic data

sheets were screened and those respondents not satisfying the criterion were eliminated from further consideration. Therefore all subjects included in the study were university undergraduates, had never been married, had no children, were not full-time employees, and were between 17 and 25 years of age.

Four hundred thirty-four subjects were included in the sample. This sample consisted of 234 females and 200 males. The mean age was 19.4 years. The racial makeup was predominately caucasian (86%), with the rest of the population being either black (6%), hispanic (5%), or other (3%). Table 2 provides information in regard to academic class, relationship status, and academic major for the male and female sub-samples and for the combined sample.

For the most part the proposed distribution of the sample was satisfied. The only exception was in regards to academic class level. The senior class is under-represented in the total sample (15%) due to the fact that they were more likely to be eliminated because they were either too old, full-time employees, married, or parents.

Of the 59 subjects solicited for retesting, 6 either did not return or provided incomplete sets of responses. The remaining 53 subjects made up the subsample used for investigating temporal stability. They consisted of males ($n=29$) and females ($n=24$) who were predominately white (87%) and represented several academic majors. The mean age was

Table 2
Description of Subjects Expressed as
Percentage of Total Sample (N=434)

Variables	Female ^a	Male ^b	Combined
Class			
Freshman	20.3	16.8	37.1
Sophomore	14.1	9.7	23.7
Junior	12.9	11.3	24.2
Senior	6.7	8.3	15.0
Relationship Status			
Single, no relat.	22.8	27.4	50.2
Single, in relat.	28.6	17.5	46.1
Engaged	2.5	1.2	3.7
Major			
Undecided	9.4	9.9	19.4
Business	9.0	7.4	16.4
Social Sciences	6.9	7.1	14.1
Health Related	9.2	1.4	10.6
Physical Sciences	2.8	5.3	8.1
Education	6.5	1.2	7.6
Journalism and Communications	4.4	1.8	6.2
Engineering	1.4	4.2	5.5
Computer Science	1.4	3.2	4.6
Recreation	.5	1.6	2.1
Agriculture	.9	.7	1.6
Architecture	0	1.4	1.4
Animal Science	.5	.2	.7
Arts	.2	.5	.7
Languages	.5	.2	.7
Undetermined	.5	0	.5

Note: Percentages rounded to first decimal.

^a_n = 234

^b_n = 200

18.6 years with most of the subsample being freshmen (66%) and sophomores (23%).

In summary, the total sample was characterized as a young, single, predominately caucasian undergraduate population that represented a variety of academic disciplines. This sample generally satisfied the sample criterion proposed by the researcher.

Data Collection and Recording Procedures

After potential subjects had signed up for a group administration time or after arrangements had been made with an instructor, the researcher decided whether or not additional administrators were necessary. In most cases, the designated administrator(s) was able to arrange chairs and materials in an appropriate manner to insure maximum comfort and efficiency in the test administration.

At the designated time, the administrator began presenting instructions to the group. These instructions began by thanking them for their participation and indicating the general purpose of their task. Subject anonymity and the fact that there are no right or wrong answers to this test was emphasized. Subjects were instructed not to begin to fill out information on the instrument packet or to look ahead until instructed to do so. At this point the Informed Consent Form (see Appendix C) was distributed by the administrator. The administrator indicated the purpose of this

form and that it could be kept for their own information, as long as the bottom portion was signed and returned.

When all subjects were finished, the demographic data sheet (Appendix B) was distributed. Subjects were instructed to place all numerical answers in the designated right-hand column and to provide all the information requested. After asking if there were any questions, several minutes were allowed to complete the task.

The next page of the packet provided to the subjects was a NCS Trans-optic answer sheet (type f3891-5) used by the University of Florida Office of Instructional Resources. Subjects were instructed to place the information from the demographic data sheet onto the NCS answer sheet. Information regarding their major was later coded on the answer sheet by the researcher.

The administrator then asked if there were any questions. After questions were answered, the LRE Scales form was distributed. ✓ The administrator then indicated their readiness to begin, emphasizing that 1) all items were to be completed, 2) they were to progress without looking back or ahead, 3) to work quietly without conferring with others in the subject group and if questions needed answering they were to raise their hands. They were then instructed to begin with the LRE Scales, placing their answers onto the NCS answer sheet.

As each subject completed the instrument packet, they brought their materials to the administrator. The

administrator quickly scanned the materials for completeness, had them sign the experimental confirmation roster, and thanked them for their participation.

In the subsample used to investigate temporal stability, the first administration proceeded as described above. In addition, their agreement to return in two weeks was confirmed. When subjects handed in their packet, the last four digits of their social security number were obtained and kept on a list along with their assigned identification number. During the second administration, the purpose of the study was restated. Then the administrator called out each social security number and distributed the corresponding packet. The packet in the second administration consisted only of the LRE Scales and another NCS answer sheet coded by the identification number. After this task was completed, they turned in their materials and signed the experimental confirmation roster.

After every administration, the demographic data sheets were screened for usable subjects based on the established criteria and a tally was maintained. This procedure allowed the researcher to determine the number of additional courses needed for administration of the instrument packet.

The researcher coded each subject's present or intended major onto the NCS answer sheet according to the Major Abbreviations utilized by the University of Florida and checked to see that the subject had correctly entered their demographic data on the NCS answer sheet.

After all data had been entered on the NCS answer sheets, they were submitted to the Office of Instructional Resources, University of Florida, for the data to be recorded on a computer magnetic tape. This tape was submitted to the Northeast Regional Data Center (NERDC) for storage of the data file. The data was then ready for retrieval by a computer terminal for subsequent statistical analyses.

Statistical Analyses

Several different statistical procedures were used to assess the factor structure, internal consistency, and temporal stability of the instrument.

Factor Structure of LRE Scales

As a form of construct validity, item responses were factor analyzed to determine the factor structure the LRE Scales. The researcher utilized the computer programs developed by Guertin and Bailey (1970) for factor analytic study. This section describes in greater detail the specific statistical procedures used.

Because the factor structure of the LRE Scales was potentially different for the male and female subgroups, their item responses were initially analyzed separately. Raw data for each sex were factor analyzed by the Principal Axes Methods (computer program ED501, in Guertin and Bailey, 1970), utilizing estimates of communality for the values

placed in the principal diagonal of the initial correlation matrix. The squared multiple-correlation coefficient, R^2 , was used as the communality estimate with one iteration being made. The resulting factors with latent roots of at least 1.00 were then orthogonally rotated to a varimax criterion. Solutions with one less and one more factor were also tried in the orthogonal rotation.

Due to the apparent similarity between the male and female factor structures, the combined sample (N=434) was factor analyzed using the above procedure. Because the factors resulting from the orthogonal rotation were considered as potentially interrelated, the principal axes factor loadings of these factors were also submitted to an oblique rotation analysis (computer program ED512, in Guertin and Bailey, 1970).

The research question concerned with determining the LRE Scale's factor structure was addressed by first examining which items heavily loaded on each factor. Those items unable to produce a loading of at least .50 on a factor were eliminated from further consideration. The factors consisting of the remaining items were then examined as to general content and the apparent construct being measured. For each resulting factor, the contributing items were then examined for their ability to have at least a .50 loading on the corresponding factor for the male and female subsample analyses.

The question of whether or not the proposed factor structure of the LRE Scales was supported by the derived factor structure was then addressed. The factors derived by the above procedures were compared to the proposed factors. Comparisons were made with regards to 1) the actual items included in a factor and 2) the common content that generally characterized the factor.

Reliability of LRE Scales

Internal consistency between the items for each proposed LRE Scale was assessed by use of the Coefficient Alpha formula (Cronbach, 1951). This generalized formula is used when items have multiple scores (Anastasi, 1976) and therefore was appropriate for data obtained from the LRE Scales.

To show the extent to which scores on the LRE Scales were temporally stable, test-retest reliability coefficients were computed. Scale sum scores for the first administration were correlated with the scale sum scores from a second administration two weeks later. A Pearson Product-moment correlation coefficient was computed for each proposed subscale of the LRE Scales.

Methodological Assumptions and Limitations

The factor analytic method of investigating the LRE Scales was considered the procedure of choice for this study. In terms of relevant items and derived factors, this

analysis was assumed to be a necessary first step before further study on the instrument could be conducted.

A major limitation of the factor analytic method is that it is only a measure of internal validity. Even when an adequate factor structure is derived, the nature of these factors is not proven. The nature of a derived factor can only be suggested by the content of the items that support it.

This researcher assumed that the sample studied was representative of one of the populations for which the LRES was intended. It was heterogeneous enough to provide systematic variance desirable for doing a factor analytic study, yet homogeneous enough so as not to produce confounding results due to developmental differences in age and/or life stage.

A limitation of this study was that the applicability of the results to other college/university populations should be approached with caution. For instance, the LRES factor structure may differ for colleges and universities that emphasize either particular religious orientations, specific academic disciplines, or significantly different ethnic group compositions.

A further limitation of this study was the inability to control for a social desirability response style. Although the LRES items did not lend themselves to obvious grouping, anonymity was provided to respondents, and a heterogeneous population helped to reduce the relevant contributions of

response bias variance, social desirability was still a problem for consideration.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The LRE Scales were subjected to several data analyses to evaluate their validities and reliabilities. Construct validity was addressed by examining the factor structure of the LRE Scales and reliability was assessed by examining the internal consistency and temporal stability of the proposed instrument. The findings of these analyses are presented and discussed in this chapter.

Validity

Several factor analyses were conducted on the data for the purpose of ascertaining the factor structure of the LRE Scales. Factor analyses were initially conducted on the male and female subsamples. Subsequent factor analyses were conducted on the combined sample. The factor structures resulting from these analyses are presented in this section.

Factor Structure of the LRE Scales

The data collected from the male (n=200) and female (n=234) subsamples were factor analyzed separately using the

principal axes method. For the male subsample eleven factors with latent roots of at least 1.00 resulted from this method. This factor solution and two additional factor solutions (with one more and one less factor) were orthogonally rotated. For the female subsample ten factors with latent roots of at least 1.00 resulted from this method. This factor solution and two additional factor solutions (with one more and one less factor) were orthogonally rotated.

For each sex the three factor solutions provided similar results, although the male eleven factor solution and the female ten factor solution provided the clearest factor structures. The eleven factor solution for the male subsample (Appendix D) accounted for 52.66 percent of the total score variance and 72.76 percent of the common factor variance. The ten factor solution for the female subsample (Appendix E) accounted for 53.18 percent of the total score variance and 73.68 percent of the common factor variance.

A comparison of the male and female factor structures indicated they were very similar. There were eight factors resulting from the male analysis that corresponded to eight similar factors resulting from the female analysis. The correspondence of factors was based on a male factor and a female factor having shared a similar set of strong loading items. The items that produced factor loadings of at least .50 on the male and female factors are shown in Table 3.

Since larger samples increase the reliabilities of the correlation coefficients and therefore produce more stable factor structures, the raw data for the combined sample ($n=434$) were factor analyzed to determine the factor structure of the instrument. A principal axes factor analysis was conducted. Eight factors with latent roots of at least 1.00 emerged from this analysis. This factor solution and solutions with one less and one more factor were orthogonally rotated. Although the seven, eight, and nine factor solutions produced similar factor structures, the nine factor solution, depicted in Table 4, provided the clearest structure. This solution accounts for 49.64 percent of the total variance and 75.22 percent of the common factor variance.

An oblique rotation was also performed on the data and the resulting intercorrelations of the primary factors indicated that the nine factors were relatively independent of each other. Of the 36 possible correlations, only the correlations between factors 1 and 2 and between factors 4 and 5 produced coefficients of at least .40 (.40 and .44, respectively). The remaining 34 correlation coefficients were less than .27. Therefore, the orthogonally rotated nine-factor solution was considered appropriate for determining the factor structure of the LRE Scales.

An examination of the factor loadings in this solution resulted in the elimination of 15 items: 1, 3, 8, 14, 18, 22, 24, 27, 31, 37, 39, 43, 49, 55, and 60. These items

Table 4

Factor Loadings for Items Following Principal
Axes Factor Analysis with Orthogonal
Rotation Using Combined Sample

Item	Factor					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
42	-.743	-.186	-.015	-.012	.075	.052
58	.734	.153	-.150	.016	.076	-.014
47	.725	.288	-.084	.037	-.024	.042
53	-.711	-.277	-.033	.045	.153	-.023
32	.611	.102	-.151	.040	.049	-.062
35	.599	.091	-.236	-.023	.071	.013
44	-.592	-.194	.082	-.107	.116	.013
16	.570	.399	-.001	-.020	-.022	.044
6	.559	.085	.009	-.001	-.040	.117
12	.556	.275	.049	.018	-.053	.039
43	.464	.171	-.158	.024	-.006	.139
37	-.349	-.096	.342	.015	.281	.071
26	.207	.708	.007	-.052	.012	.067
38	.260	.702	.013	-.085	-.029	.038
15	.289	.696	-.077	-.093	.007	.142
41	.175	.676	-.017	.028	-.145	.081
21	.315	.596	-.038	-.042	.066	.045
57	.371	.564	-.026	.009	.024	-.050
29	.543	.553	-.013	-.021	-.069	.088
33	-.470	-.535	.033	.010	.019	.138
40	-.027	.018	.737	.010	.063	.002
17	-.148	.008	.729	-.109	.118	-.035
20	-.007	-.014	.690	-.012	.028	.082
23	.073	.138	-.651	-.148	-.090	.170
5	.046	-.109	.644	.255	.162	.017
28	-.112	.078	.609	.036	.133	-.105
14	.080	.182	-.298	-.252	-.069	.240
52	-.016	.061	.090	.676	.170	-.071
46	-.018	.018	.074	.676	.196	-.010
30	-.000	.088	.017	.592	.217	.060
4	.016	.026	-.055	.590	.058	.026
13	-.098	.073	-.076	-.584	-.097	-.011
54	-.050	.081	.048	-.559	-.035	.071
1	.040	.011	.088	.417	.379	.037
22	.031	.119	-.193	-.342	-.283	.010
24	.033	-.082	.014	.340	.147	.074
60	.167	.145	-.004	-.329	-.279	-.006

Continued

Table 4
Continued

Item	Factor					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
36	-.019	.042	.190	.144	.685	.062
45	-.116	-.012	.202	.225	.682	.059
59	-.023	-.094	.092	.389	.677	.043
56	.043	-.047	-.082	.368	.574	-.057
34	.022	-.039	.098	.376	.510	-.112
27	-.013	.066	-.159	-.399	-.457	-.027
18	-.262	.045	.216	.107	.415	.291
8	-.230	.039	.211	.097	.379	.064
7	.118	.089	-.298	-.093	.020	.698
19	-.013	.029	.252	.084	.003	.622
2	.093	-.001	-.029	.036	.048	.599
11	.153	.085	-.390	-.140	-.051	.584
25	-.011	.011	.211	.062	-.040	.557
9	-.094	.034	.001	.037	.098	.553
50	.216	.410	-.118	.066	-.020	.032
51	.174	.262	-.182	.076	-.075	-.013
39	.467	.005	-.195	.011	.045	.032
55	.388	.336	-.233	-.000	.087	-.066
48	.001	.081	.095	-.141	-.082	.008
10	-.055	.104	.071	-.010	.057	.038
31	-.248	-.337	.197	-.073	.139	.160
49	-.292	-.342	.155	-.045	.089	.096
3	-.137	-.352	.062	-.033	.112	.106
Column Sum of Squared Loadings	6.38	4.66	3.99	3.79	3.29	2.61
Percent of Total Variance	10.6	7.8	6.7	6.3	5.5	4.4
Percent of All Common Variance	16.1	11.8	10.1	9.6	8.3	6.6

Continued

Table 4
Continued

Item	Factor		
	7	8	9
42	.006	.076	.093
58	.257	.035	-.108
47	.089	.050	-.240
53	-.005	-.007	.075
32	.412	-.034	-.063
35	.317	.011	-.105
44	.051	.128	.114
16	-.101	.007	.186
6	.091	-.065	-.022
12	-.003	-.031	.107
43	.335	.086	.147
37	-.078	-.017	-.010
26	.109	.100	.050
38	.220	.122	-.075
15	.073	.006	-.018
41	.197	.060	.047
21	-.022	.024	-.110
57	-.024	.123	-.301
29	-.019	.123	.108
33	-.030	.014	.339
40	-.042	.099	.024
17	-.049	-.016	.036
20	-.116	.061	-.031
23	.091	.004	.074
5	-.034	.097	.125
28	-.105	.085	.104
14	-.058	.134	-.063
52	.136	.023	.024
46	-.020	.027	-.043
30	-.009	.126	.001
4	-.150	.023	.101
13	-.002	.085	.059
54	-.182	.182	.004
1	-.006	-.119	.050
22	.191	.264	.075
24	.168	.011	-.222
60	.023	.104	-.017

Continued

Table 4
Continued

Item	Factor		
	7	8	9
36	-.075	.221	.074
45	.012	.163	.191
59	.095	-.059	-.046
56	.000	-.084	-.065
34	.130	-.073	-.244
27	.129	.015	.079
18	-.017	-.133	.200
8	.038	-.124	.140
7	-.008	-.009	.055
19	-.122	.344	-.237
2	.075	-.141	.128
11	.029	-.022	.051
25	-.099	.368	-.215
9	.030	.027	.088
50	.567	-.056	-.096
51	.529	-.012	-.069
39	.488	.069	.057
55	.462	.025	-.268
48	.013	.642	.055
10	.011	.580	.080
31	-.065	.256	.483
49	-.079	.183	.416
3	-.206	.203	.376
Column Sum of Squared Loadings	1.97	1.60	1.49
Percent of Total Variance	3.3	2.7	2.5
Percent of All Common Variance	5.0	4.0	3.8

Note. The factor matrix has been rearranged so the columns appear in order of decreasing amount of variance accounted for by factors. Rows have been reordered so that for each successive factor, the largest loadings appear first.

loaded less than .50 on any factor. Only one item (29) loaded on more than one factor. However, since the content of the item was more related to factor one, this item was included in that factor for interpretation. Also, since there were no items loading greater than .50 on factor nine, it was eliminated from further interpretation. The remaining eight factors and the items comprising them are presented in Table 5.

Factor 1 consisted of eleven items, with factor loadings ranging from .54 to .74. The content of these items generally related to personal expectations of parenthood. The content of these items are an affirmation of the value or importance of having children, being successful as a parent, and devoting a great deal of time and effort in raising children. Three "negatively" phrased items produced negative loadings.

Factor 2 consisted of seven items, with factor loadings ranging from .54 to .71. The content of these items generally related to personal expectations of marriage. The item content was either an affirmation of the value of having a successful marriage, being married, or viewing marriage as an important aspect of one's life. One negatively phrased item produced a negative loading.

Table 5
Factor Structure of LRE Scales

<u>Factor 1</u>	Item	Factor Loading
42.	The whole idea of having children and raising them is kind of distasteful to me.	-.74
58.	It is important to me to feel effective/successful as a parent.	.73
47.	The rewards and satisfactions of having a family are worth all the time and effort it takes.	.73
53.	Having children is not one of my life goals.	-.71
32.	I expect to devote time and attention to developing my skills as an effective and loving parent.	.61
35.	I expect to devote a great deal of time and energy to raising my children in the manner they need.	.60
44.	I feel it is more important to have some time for myself and my own development than have children and be responsible for them.	-.59
16.	My life would seem empty if I never had children.	.57
6.	Although parenthood requires many sacrifices, the love and enjoyment of my own child(ren) are worth it all.	.56
12.	If I chose not to have children, I know I would later regret it.	.56
29.	The rewards and satisfactions of raising a family are more important to me than anything else.	.54

Continued

Table 5
Continued

<u>Factor 2</u>	Item	Factor Loading
26.	I expect my marriage to give me more real personal satisfaction than anything else I do.	.71
38.	Being married to a person I love and who loves me is more important to me than anything else.	.70
15.	Having a successful marriage is the most important thing in life to me.	.70
41.	I expect the major satisfactions in my life to come from my relationship with my spouse.	.68
21.	My life would seem empty if I never married.	.60
57.	I could never be truly happy unless I was married to someone I loved and respected.	.56
33.	Marriage does not figure in my life plans.	-.54

<u>Factor 3</u>	Item	Factor Loading
40.	Although I want to be consulted, I expect to be less involved than my spouse in the day-to-day operation of our home.	.74
17.	Although I will be involved, I expect another person(s) to be more in charge of organizing and directing my children's activities.	.73
20.	I expect to leave most of the day-to-day decisions of running our home to someone else.	.69
23.	I expect to stay home to care for my children when they are sick.	-.65

Continued

Table 5
Continued

<u>Factor 3 (cont'd)</u>		
Item		Factor Loading
5. I expect to be the one in my family who assumes primary responsibility for providing for my family financially.		.65
28. Although I expect to be involved in decisions regarding my children, I expect another caretaker to have the major responsibility for carrying out those decisions on a daily basis.		.61
<u>Factor 4</u>		
Item		Factor Loading
52. Although others may work with me in completing certain aspects of my job I want to be the one who makes the major decisions regarding my work and how it gets done.		.68
46. In my job I expect to have a major say regarding how my work tasks are organized, delegated, and/or planned for.		.68
30. I expect to have the primary responsibility for organizing and directing my work activities.		.59
4. I expect to make most of the day-to-day decisions regarding my work rather than take direction from someone else.		.59
13. I do not picture myself assuming a position of leadership in my job.		-.58
54. I prefer to leave most of the day-to-day decisions regarding my work to someone else.		-.56

Continued

Table 5
Continued

<u>Factor 5</u>		
	Item	Factor Loading
36.	I expect to do whatever it takes to move up in my career.	.69
45.	I expect to make as many sacrifices as are necessary in order to get ahead in my job/career.	.68
59.	I value being successful in my job/career and expect to devote the necessary time and effort needed to be successful.	.68
56.	Feeling successful in my job/career is essential to my feeling good about myself.	.57
34.	It is important for me to be successful in my work/career.	.51
<u>Factor 6</u>		
	Item	Factor Loading
7.	I expect to be the one most involved in coordinating my child(ren)'s day-to-day activities.	.70
19.	I expect to be the one in my marriage who plans most of our fun outings and activities.	.62
2.	I expect to make most of the day-to-day decisions regarding the rearing of my children.	.60
11.	I expect to assume primary responsibility for the daily care of my children.	.58
25.	Although my spouse would be consulted, I expect to be the one who plans and organizes most of our social activities.	.56
9.	I expect to make most of the day-to-day decisions regarding the operation and maintenance of my home.	.55

Continued

Table 5
Continued

<hr/>		
<u>Factor 7</u>	Item	Factor Loading
50.	I expect to do whatever it takes to make my spouse/partner feel loved, supported, and cared for.	.57
51.	I expect to devote a regular time each day to being alone with my spouse to catch up on what is happening and resolve problems, and/or just relax/play together.	.53
<hr/>		
<u>Factor 8</u>	Item	Factor Loading
48.	My work is merely a means of earning an income so that I can afford to do the things that I really enjoy.	.64
10.	To me, a job should be viewed primarily as a means of making a living.	.58
<hr/>		

Factor 3 consisted of six items, with factor loadings ranging from .61 to .74. The content of the items generally related to expectations of the home/family environment. The contents of the items are an affirmation of the desire not to participate in the "day to day" tasks of running a household and caring for children, or to be less involved than others. The content of the items reflected involvement in executive decision-making functions, but limited one's time commitment to these activities. One negatively phrased item produced a negative loading.

Factor 4 consisted of six items, with factor loadings ranging from .56 to .68. The content of all the items generally related to personal expectations of a career. The content of the items appeared to be an affirmation of a desire to participate in the decision-making, organizational, and planning aspects of one's work. They were characterized by a general sense of wanting to be in control of how one functions in his or her job. Two negatively phrased items produced negative loadings.

Factor 5 consisted of five items, with factor loadings ranging from .51 to .69. The content of these items generally related to personal expectations of work. The item content was typically an affirmation of a desire and willingness to do whatever was necessary to be successful in a career and the items generally indicated the importance of being successful in a career.

Factor 6 consisted of six items, with factor loadings ranging from .55 to .70. The content of the items generally related to expectations of parenthood and marriage. The content of these items was an affirmation of the desire to be the major decision-maker in regards to raising children, planning activities, and maintaining a home.

Factor 7 consisted of two items with factor loadings of .64 and .58. The content of the items related to personal expectations regarding a marital partner. The items represented a willingness to put time and effort into maintaining intimacy in the marital relationship.

Factor 8 consisted of two items with loadings of .58 and .64. The content of the items related to expectations concerning work. The items are affirmations of the view of work as a necessity and a means by which other aspects of life could be enjoyed.

The 45 items with factor loadings of at least .50 were then examined to determine how they loaded on the appropriate corresponding factors for both the male and female factor structures. Table 6 presents the loadings of these items that were produced for each similar factor of the male, female, and combined sample factor structures. Although 15 items (44, 16, 6, 12, 29, 33, 23, 5, 13, 54, 34, 19, 25, 9, and 51) loaded at least .50 on the factors derived in the analysis of the combined sample, they did not satisfy this criterion on the corresponding factor of either the male or female factor structures. The remaining items

Table 6

Loadings for Items of Each Factor Following
Principal Axes Factor Analysis with
Orthogonal Rotation for Each Sex
and Combined Sample

Item	Sample		
	Total	Male	Female
Factor 1			
42	-.74	-.56	-.79
58	.73	.71	.70
47	.73	.60	.74
53	-.71	-.50	-.71
32	.61	.73	.56
35	.60	.71	.54
44	-.59	-.36	-.59
16	.57	.41	.59
6	.56	.40	.69
12	.56	.39	.57
29	.54	.29	.56
Factor 2			
26	.71	.74	.70
38	.70	.72	.66
15	.70	.70	.64
41	.68	.69	.67
21	.60	.66	.58
57	.56	.59	.53
33	-.54	-.59	-.47
Factor 3			
40	.74	.74	.59
17	.73	.68	.67
20	.69	.66	.71
23	-.65	-.47	-.21
5	.64	.44	.24
28	.61	.55	.55
Factor 4			
52	.68	.58	.69
46	.68	.69	.64
30	.59	.64	.65
4	.59	.68	.59
13	-.58	-.36	-.47
54	-.56	-.42	-.50

Continued

Table 6
Continued

Item	Total	Sample	
		Male	Female
Factor 5			
36	.69	.73	.74
45	.68	.70	.72
59	.68	.66	.74
56	.57	.55	.59
34	.51	.45	.58
Factor 6			
7	.70	.71	.72
19	.62	.44	.38
2	.60	.61	.65
11	.58	.55	.74
25	.56	.48	.26
9	.55	.37	.63
Factor 7			
50	.57	.61	-.53
51	.53	.57	-.49
Factor 8			
48	.64	.77	.56
10	.58	.57	.58

Note. Only those items loading at least .50 on a factor for the combined sample are included in table.

were considered as strongly supporting a unisex form of the LRE Scales.

Comparison of the Proposed and Derived Factor Structures

In general, the proposed factor structure of the LRE Scales was supported by the derived factor structure. The proposed constructs were evidenced by the derived factors with most of the contributing items being consistent with the constructs and proposed item structure of these constructs. Agreement between the proposed and derived factor structures was not complete, however.

The proposed Occupational Role Reward Value (OV) scale was addressed by factors 5 and 8. In regard to item make-up, factor 5 consists of two items (36, 59) proposed to belong in the Level of Occupational Role Participation (OP) Scale. The remaining three items and both items in factor 8 were proposed in the OV Scale. An examination of factor 5 indicates that the two "misplaced" items were consistent with the other items. Five of the proposed OV items (1, 8, 18, 22, 27) were eliminated for their inability to load on any of the derived factors.

While factors 5 and 8 are related to the proposed OV construct, they measure different aspects of this dimension. Factor 5 addresses the value of being successful in a career whereas factor 8 addresses the view of work as a means of making a living. Because the two factors are orthogonally unrelated, a person could respond in a similar or dissimilar

direction. While factor 5 is most closely related to the proposed construct definition, a person's response could be further defined by factor 8.

The proposed Marital Role Reward Value (MV) Scale was addressed by factor 2. All the items included in this factor were proposed as contributing to the same scale. Three of the proposed items (3, 31, 49) did not load on any of the derived factors. The content of the remaining items loading on this factor supported the proposed construct definition.

The proposed Parental Role Reward Value (PV) Scale was addressed by factor 1. All ten items proposed to make up this scale loaded on this factor. An additional item (35) loaded on this factor but was proposed for inclusion in the Level of Parental Role Participation (PP) Scale. The content and phrasing of this item is similar to item 32, which was proposed for inclusion in the PV Scale. Regardless if either item was "misplaced" in the proposed factor structure, they are consistent with the other items in the derived factor. The proposed PV Scale is strongly supported by this factor.

The proposed Level of Occupation Role Participation (OP) Scale is related to factor 4. The six items that loaded on this derived factor were proposed to be related to this scale. Four of the proposed items (24, 36, 59, 60) did not load on this factor, with two of the items loading on

factor 5. The remaining six items are supportive of the proposed construct definition.

Two proposed scales, Level of Marital Role Participation (MP) and Level of Parental Role Participation (PP) were not differentiated by the derived factors. Instead, items proposed for these two scales were grouped together in factors 3 and 6. Each derived factor contained three items proposed for the MP Scale and three items proposed for the PP Scale. Both factors were concerned with participation in a general home/family environment. Yet, the two factors address different and orthogonally unrelated aspects of this participation dimension. Factor 6 appears to contain items concerned with executive responsibility as a major decision maker in regards to family/home functions. Factor 3 is generally more concerned with the responsibility for carrying out these functions on a daily basis. Although the derived factors were unable to support differentiating parental and marital role participation, they were able to discriminate between two distinctive and specific aspects of this dimension.

The proposed MP Scale was additionally supported by factor 7. This derived factor consisted of two items proposed for inclusion in the MP Scale. This factor contained items dealing with the maintenance of an intimate relationship with a spouse. Therefore, this factor is related to the proposed construct, but addresses a more specific aspect.

In summary, the proposed MP, PV, and OP Scales were strongly supported by the derived factors. The OV Scale was conceptually supported, but partially by items proposed for inclusion in another scale. The MP and PP Scales were not supported as being separate but were more specifically defined as two distinct home/family participation dimensions.

Reliability

Internal Consistency of the LRE Scales

The total sample of 434 subjects was used for establishing the internal consistency of the LRE Scales. A Coefficient Alpha was computed for each proposed scale. These results are presented in Table 7.

The analysis of the proposed Level of Marital Role Participation (MP) Scale produced a very low reliability coefficient indicating a lack of homogeneity among the MP items. The five remaining scales were shown to possess a much greater degree of internal consistency.

Temporal Stability of the LRE Scales

A total of 53 subjects were retested at a two-week interval to establish the temporal stability of the LRE Scales. A Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient was obtained for each proposed subscale and are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Temporal Stability and Internal Consistency Data
for Each Proposed LRE Scale

Scale	Reliability Coefficients	
	Test-Retest	Alpha
Occupational Role Reward Value	.48*	.72
Marital Role Reward Value	.85*	.87
Parental Role Reward Value	.77*	.89
Level of Occupational Role Participation	.51*	.79
Level of Marital Role Participation	.46*	.13
Level of Parental Role Participation	.82*	.77

*Significant at .001 level.

The proposed Occupation Role Reward Value (OV) Scale, the Level of Occupational Role Participation (OP) Scale, and the Level of Marital Role Participation (MP) Scale produced reliability coefficients less than .70 and were considered to be unstable over a short period of time. The three remaining scales were evidenced as measuring more stable responses over the same time period.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The focus of this study was the Life Role Expectations Scales, developed by Amatea and Cross (1983) to measure the reward value and the level of participation in occupational, marital, and parental roles. A review of the life role literature indicated the LRE Scales were conceptually promising. However, this instrument lacked rigorous support for its validity and reliability. The purpose of this study was therefore to assess its psychometric properties. The factor structure, temporal stability, and internal consistency of the instrument were of specific interest.

For the purpose of examining the validity of the proposed instrument, a large sample of young, unmarried, childless, male and female university students was obtained and the collected data for each sex were factor analyzed separately. Due to a similarity between the resulting factor structures, the data were factor analyzed for the combined sample. A principal axes method of factor analysis, orthogonally rotated to a varimax criterion, was used and a structure of eight factors was obtained. Fifteen items were unable to load adequately on any factor and were eliminated from consideration.

The factor structure resulting from this analysis supported three of the proposed scales and partially supported the other three proposed scales. The proposed Marital Role Reward Value (MV), Parental Role Reward Value (PV), and Level of Occupational Participation (OP) Scales were supported by the derived factors. The proposed items of the marital (MP) and parental (PP) role participation scales were combined to form two home/family factors, each representing a different aspect of the participation dimension. One factor appeared to address temporal participation in home/family roles, while the other factor appeared to address decision-making participation in these roles. The Occupational Role Reward Value (OV) Scale was not supported as originally proposed. It was closely related to a factor which addressed the reward value of career success, however. The items which strongly loaded on a derived factor were cross-examined for their loadings on the corresponding factors of the male and female analysis. Thirty items were shown to have strong loadings on corresponding factors of all factor analyses.

For the purpose of investigating reliability, the internal consistency and temporal stability of the proposed instrument were analyzed. The Level of Marital Role Participation (MP) Scale was the only proposed scale that was not internally consistent. The proposed MV, PV, and PP Scales were shown to be temporally reliable over a two week period of time.

Conclusions

It was not surprising this study indicated a need for some degree of refinement at this stage of the instrument's development. However, this study generally supported the potential use of a common form for both sexes, the independence of the factors, and the validity and reliability of the proposed LRE Scales.

Unisex Form of LRE Scales

The results of this study indicated a unisex form of the LRE Scales was potentially justified. Two general findings tentatively supported this proposal. This was first suggested by the similar nature of the male and female factor structures. Although these factor structures were not in complete agreement, they appeared to be more similar than different. A second finding offering support was that the majority of items loading on the combined sample factors were able to load on the corresponding factors of both the male and female factor structures.

The results of the combined sample factor analysis were considered stronger evidence than the male and female analyses in regards to determining the instrument's factor structure. This is due to the fact that larger samples provide more variance, increase the reliability of the correlation coefficients, and provide clearer factor structures. Therefore, a larger sample was preferred for this

analysis, provided it would produce results with potential meaning for either sex.

The suggestion of a similar factor structure for males and females needs to be approached with caution, however. This similarity was based on nothing more than a non-statistical comparison. While these results lend support to the possibility of a unisex instrument, this is still tentative until statistical methods provide the necessary confirmation.

Independence of Factors

The choice of an orthogonal rotation procedure was supported by the low intercorrelations between the primary factors. This was largely a methodological decision, but general conclusions can be tentatively made about the relationship between the derived factors.

In general, the derived factors appeared to address independent dimensions. This could be interpreted to mean the level of agreement with one dimension was unrelated to the level of agreement with another dimension. This does not suggest that subjects responding to a particular life role dimension do not consider other aspects. Indeed, people may not consider their different life roles in isolation. This study only suggested that how individuals responded to one dimension did not imply how they responded to another.

The apparent degree of factor independence varied, depending upon which derived factors were compared. For example, although none of the correlations between the factors were very high, there was some relationship between factors 1 and 2 and between factors 4 and 5. These relationships were seemingly not as independent as the other thirty-four possible relationships.

Although this study suggests the derived factors are relatively independent, any inference that scales resulting from these factors would also be independent should be approached with caution. The findings suggest this is a possibility. But without further investigation, this is not confirmed.

Validity of Role Reward Value Scales

Since the validity of the proposed Marital (MV) and Parental (PV) Role Reward Value Scales was supported by this study, it was surprising the proposed Occupational Role Reward Value (OV) Scale did not fair as well, since it proposed to measure the same general construct. An examination of the proposed OV items showed many differences that provide a possible explanation.

Some of the OV items were ambiguous in the ideas they presented. For example, with item number 22 it is difficult to determine if a person agrees/disagrees with wanting to work or with wanting a demanding career. The ideas

expressed in this OV item are not synonymous. This ambiguity could contribute to a lack of consistency in relation to other OV items and produce a smaller factor loading.

Some of the MV and PV items are ambiguous but the implications may be different. For example, item number 57 of the MV Scale is ambiguous. Does the item address being married or loving and respecting a spouse? The difference is that it is difficult to imagine a person wanting to be married to someone they didn't love and respect.

The proposed OV Scale also seemed to present more varied ideas than did the other role reward value scales. The OV items address advancement, achieving importance, being interested and excited, work as a necessity, obtaining satisfaction, building a reputation, and being successful. These ideas are apparently diverse enough that a strong factor did not emerge.

Three of the OV items dealt with achieving success in a career. These items produced the strongest loadings on factor 5. This success construct is more specific than the general construct measured in the other role reward value scales.

Also, there is a tendency for the proposed OV items to assume a career will be pursued. The other role reward value scales generally provide the person with a greater ability to reject these roles.

Validity of Level of Role Participation Scales

This study raised two important concerns in regards to the validity of the participation dimension. The first was the lack of distinction between the proposed marital and parental participation items. The second was the separatedness of the proposed participation dimension into two independent factors.

The lack of a distinction between the proposed MP and PP items could be partially due to the fact several of the MP items did not address what they proposed. An examination of the MP items loading on factors 3 and 6 indicated they referred to a spouse or marriage, but the main thrust was participation in running a home, providing family finances, and planning social activities. How much one participated in these functions, not their expectations of participating in the marital relationship, appeared to be the construct being measured.

Besides their inabilities to address the proposed construct definition, the MP items were also unable to form a strong factor because six of the items loaded with six of the PP items to form two factors. Planning social activities and maintaining a home were apparently considered in the same manner as raising children. Both of the resulting factors seemed to address a more general home/family participation dimension.

The two separate factors evolving for this home/family participation dimension required further explanation.

Factor 6 was generally concerned with participation in executive decision-making functions. The items did not necessarily imply the respondent expected to carry out these decisions out. Factor 3 seemed to address more clearly this latter aspect.

Reliability of Proposed LRE Scales

Three of the proposed LRE Scales were shown to be unstable over time and one of these scales lacked internal consistency. Possible reasons for the inadequate reliability of these proposed scales are their lack of unidimensionality, ambiguous items, the testing situation, or a combination of these conditions.

The proposed OV, MV, PV, OP, and PP scales were shown to be internally consistent. The proposed MP scale lacked this type of reliability, however. This latter finding is not surprising, since the unidimensionality of this scale was not supported by the factor analysis and the proposed MP items loaded on three different factors.

The proposed MV, PV, and PP scales were shown to be adequately stable over a two week period of time. The proposed OV, OP, and MP scales lacked this type of reliability, however. This latter finding suggested the expectations addressed by these proposed scales are subject to extreme fluctuations. While some fluctuation in attitudes could be expected, this degree of instability over such a short period of time was surprising. Therefore, this

suggested there were other possible reasons for the lack of test-retest reliabilities.

The ambiguity of some items may have also contributed to the lack of stability. An ambiguous item may be interpreted differently on two separate occasions. This situation could result in dissimilar responses and hence, such items would increase error variance and reduce reliability.

Another possible explanation for the lack of stability had to do with the testing conditions during the second administration. The entire subsample needed to be present during the second administration to obtain experiment credits as part of a course requirement. Since the retesting took place at the end of the semester, some students may have been anxious to complete the task as the only requirement left to fulfill.

Subjects may have also been motivated to quickly complete the task quickly since they could leave as soon as they were finished. There was no minimum amount of time required for participation. This motivation could have been enhanced because time is typically more precious at the end of a semester. These conditions, in combination with the possible "boredom" created by repeating a familiar task, could have contributed to carelessness in responding. In a more careless state, a person who responded "somewhat disagree" to an item during the first administration may have chosen a "disagree" response as adequately expressing his or her attitude.

Implications

There are certain implications to be made in regards to the LRE Scales, based on the results of this study. These implications address the utility of the instrument, the use of a common form for both sexes, and the relationship between the constructs.

The results of this study imply the LRE Scales need to be refined. Some degree of refinement was expected since the instrument was still in an initial stage of development. This researcher had suggested the proposed instrument was conceptually promising. These findings have suggested its psychometric properties are also promising, provided it undergoes revision to improve its validity and reliability. This revision would be necessary before the LRE Scales could be suitable for use with college populations.

The possibility of a unisex form of the LRE Scales could prove to be a major strength of the instrument. This would allow for comparisons of males and females to be made on the same dimensions. This would also improve its utility for research with college students. A major concern has been how the sexes are similar or different in their expectations of life roles. These comparisons are more difficult and less straightforward, unless common dimensions can be measured. A unisex form would also be more efficient for administrative and scoring purposes.

The lack of strong relationships between the LRE constructs (as represented by the derived factors) could

potentially be another important feature of this instrument. This would imply that individuals' expectations regarding the importance of certain roles would not indicate their expectations for participating in these roles and vice versa. For example, the degree to which a person values being a parent may not indicate the degree to which he or she expects to participate in parental decision-making or maintenance functions. Independent constructs would also imply that individuals' expectations for one role arena are not indicative of their expectations for another role arena. The use of orthogonally related scales would also suggest that there is a greater potential for varied student profiles to evolve eventually in regards to life role expectations.

Recommendations

There are two general types of recommendations suggested by this study: (1) recommendations regarding the revision of the LRE Scales and (2) recommendations regarding future research on the instrument.

Revision of the LRE Scales

It seems appropriate for a revision of the instrument to be tentatively suggested for use with college populations. It is recommended the LRE Scales should be refined by reducing the number of items, improving the clarity of some items, and by relabeling the apparent constructs being measured.

The proposed length of the scales would no longer be practical for administrative reasons and should be reduced. A common complaint of the subjects was that the same idea was repeated several times. Although a large pool of similar items may be appropriate in the early phases of development, redundancy in the refined form may only contribute to frustration. However, this is counterbalanced by a need for enough items to establish reliability.

The length of the scales should also be reduced to psychometric reasons. This study suggested the 15 items unable to load on any factor would be first eliminated. The remaining 45 items formed eight factors each consisting of a minimum of two and a maximum of eleven items. Scales of equal length would be desirable. In light of the previous discussion, five items might be optimal length for each scale. This eliminates factors 7 and 8 from consideration as scales.

The five items suggested for each scale would optimally have the strongest loadings on the related factors. It would be also desirable for these items to have sufficiently loaded on the related factors derived by analyzing the male and female subsamples.

An example of how the LRE Scales could be structured is presented in Table 8 based on the suggestions for revision. The scales were relabeled to represent the apparent construct being measured. The reduction of the scales does not seem to affect the nature of the constructs represented by

the derived factors. This was an important consideration, especially with Factor 1.

It would be appropriate to "reflect" the Temporal Participation in Home Roles Scale. That is, the item responses would be reverse scored. The composite scale score could then be more easily interpreted and compared to other scale scores.

In summary, a thirty item, six scale, unisex form of the LRE Scales was suggested by this study. This revised form was tentatively considered as appropriate for use with a population of young university students.

Recommendations For Future Research

The results of this study are only relevant for the use of the Life Role Expectations Scales with a comparable population. Similar research would be needed for the instrument to be used with dissimilar populations, such as high school students or persons fully enacting certain life roles. The recommendations in this section suggest research appropriate for the further development of the LRE Scales for use with college students.

It is suggested that further factor analytic studies with similar populations retain all 45 items that were able to load on a derived factor. These studies would help to clarify further the factor structure found in this study. It may be more practical to obtain a smaller sample size if

Table 8
Example Form of Life Role
Expectations Scales

Scale	Item Number ^{a,b}
Occupational Success Reward Value	34, 36, 45, 56, 59
Marital Role Reward Value	15, 21, 26, 38, 41
Parental Role Reward Value	32, <u>42</u> , 47, <u>53</u> , 58
Level of Occupational Role Participation	4, 30, 46, 52, 54
Temporal Participation In Home Roles	<u>5</u> , <u>17</u> , <u>20</u> , <u>28</u> , <u>40</u>
Decision-making Participation In Home Roles	2, 7, 9, 11, 19

^aUnderlined items are reverse scored.

^bItems identified by item number of original form.

a similar population is of interest. Variation in sample population characteristics would be useful for establishing generalizability. This variation is proportional to the importance of conducting subsequent factor analytic studies and the need for large samples.

Although the findings suggested the male and female factor structures were similar and the derived factors were orthogonally unrelated, these assumptions need to be further researched by more adequate statistical procedures. A

relatively new procedure, Confirmatory Factor Analysis, might be useful for testing these assumptions.

In general, the LRE Scales could be revised on the basis of any preceding factor analysis. With each analysis, a clearer and more stable factor structure should emerge. This is considered an optimal approach to determining the factor structure of the LRE Scales. Otherwise, a revised form, such as the example presented in the preceding section, would be the most appropriate for other types of validation research.

Any form of the LRE Scales would benefit by being able to produce factor scores for an individual. A scale sum score provides only a gross index. Each item contributes differentially in measuring the construct. It is better to obtain a person's scale score by using the factor loading to weight each item. Guertin and Bailey (1970) suggested this weight should be readjusted by the use of a multiple regression technique.

The temporal stability of this instrument needs to be reevaluated. This researcher suggested the retest conditions of the study were potentially problematic. Therefore, any subsequent study of temporal stability should reduce the potential for retest carelessness by the respondent. For example, both administrations could designate a minimum time necessary for participation. This could help reduce the motivation to quickly complete the task. Attention should

be paid to minimizing internal and external differences between the two administrations.

Because factor analytic results are an internal measure of construct validity, other types of research are needed. Research utilizing Multiple Regression techniques would be useful for investigating the value of the LRE Scales. The factor scores as predictors could then be examined for their abilities to determine a criterion, such as certain life role behaviors and attitudes.

Summary

The responses of 434 undergraduates to the Life Role Expectations Scales were factor analyzed to assess the instrument's construct validity. The analysis resulted in eight factors which appeared to be similar for males and females. Items not loading at least .50 on a factor were eliminated from further consideration. The derived factors strongly supported three of the proposed factors. The remaining three proposed factors received support, but were altered to some extent. All but one of the proposed scales were shown to be internally consistent. Only three of the six proposed scales were shown to be stable over time. The lack of reliability was possibly due to the proposed factors not being unidimensional, ambiguous items, testing conditions, or a combination of these reasons.

Based on this study, six scales consisting of five items each were offered as an example version of the instrument. Additional factor analytic studies were recommended further for clarifying the structure of the instrument. This was especially suggested for populations different from the sample used in this study. Further test-retest reliability studies were also considered necessary. Finally, it was recommended that additional methods of analysis should be considered to further substantiate the construct validity of the instrument.

APPENDIX A

LIFE ROLE EXPECTATIONS SCALES

DIRECTIONS: Listed below are some statements about various life roles. Read each statement and decide how much it reflects your current feelings and ideas. Choose one of the following five response categories which most closely reflects your CURRENT ideas: (1) Disagree, (2) Mostly Disagree, (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree, (4) Mostly Agree, (5) Agree. IMPORTANT: If you are not currently married, are not a parent, or are not working, please answer in terms of how you would function if in that role.

1. It is important to me that I have a job/career in which I can advance and achieve something of importance.
2. I expect to make most of the day-to-day decisions regarding the rearing of my children.
3. I doubt that the rewards of marriage make up for all the sacrifices.
4. I expect to make most of the day-to-day decisions regarding my work rather than take direction from someone else.
5. I expect to be the one in my family who assumes primary responsibility for providing for my family financially.
6. Although parenthood requires many sacrifices, the love and enjoyment of my own child(ren) are worth it all.
7. I expect to be the one most involved in coordinating my child(ren)'s day-to-day activities.
8. Having a job/career that is interesting and exciting to me is my most important goal.
9. I expect to make most of the day-to-day decisions regarding the operation and maintenance of my home.
10. To me, a job should be viewed primarily as a means of making a living.

CHOOSE: (1) Disagree, (2) Mostly Disagree, (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree, (4) Mostly Agree, (5) Agree

11. I expect to assume primary responsibility for the daily care of my children.
12. If I chose not to have children, I know I would later regret it.
13. I do not picture myself assuming a position of leadership in my job.
14. I would like to be consulted regarding financial decisions, but expect my spouse to assume primary responsibility for family financial matters.
15. Having a successful marriage is the most important thing in life to me.
16. My life would seem empty if I never had children.
17. Although I will be involved, I expect another person(s) to be more in charge of organizing and directing my children's activities.
18. I expect my job/career to give me more real satisfaction than anything else I do.
19. I expect to be the one in my marriage who plans most of our fun outings and activities.
20. I expect to leave most of the day-to-day decisions of running our home to someone else.
21. My life would seem empty if I never married.
22. I want to work, but I don't want to have a demanding career.
23. I expect to stay home to care for my children when they are sick.
24. At work I expect to assume responsibility to assure that the work gets done well.
25. Although my spouse would be consulted, I expect to be the one who plans and organizes most of our social activities.
26. I expect my marriage to give me more real personal satisfaction than anything else I do.

CHOOSE: (1) Disagree, (2) Mostly Disagree, (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree, (4) Mostly Agree, (5) Agree

27. Building a name and reputation for myself through a job/career is not one of my life goals.
28. Although I expect to be involved in decisions regarding my children, I expect another caretaker to have the major responsibility for carrying out those decisions on a daily basis.
29. The rewards and satisfactions of raising a family are more important to me than anything else.
30. I expect to have the primary responsibility for organizing and directing my work activities.
31. I believe that when a person marries their personal freedom to enjoy life becomes too limited.
32. I expect to devote time and attention to developing my skills as an effective and loving parent.
33. Marriage does not figure in my life plans.
34. It is important for me to be successful in my work/career.
35. I expect to devote a great deal of time and energy to raising my children in the manner they need.
36. I expect to do whatever it takes to move up in my career.
37. In my family I expect to have limited time to be with my children due to my outside commitments.
38. Being married to a person I love and who loves me is more important to me than anything else.
39. I expect to devote as much time as is necessary to teaching my children the skills they need to get along in this world.
40. Although I want to be consulted, I expect to be less involved than my spouse in the day-to-day operation of our home.
41. I expect the major satisfactions in my life to come from my relationship with my spouse.
42. The whole idea of having children and raising them is kind of distasteful to me.

CHOOSE: (1) Disagree, (2) Mostly Disagree, (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree, (4) Mostly Agree, (5) Agree

43. I expect to do whatever it takes to make my children's lives and development my number one priority.
44. I feel it is more important to have some time for myself and my own development than have children and be responsible for them.
45. I expect to make as many sacrifices as are necessary in order to get ahead in my job/career.
46. In my job I expect to have a major say regarding how my work tasks are organized, delegated, and/or planned for.
47. The rewards and satisfactions of having a family are worth all the time and effort it takes.
48. My work is merely a means of earning an income so that I can afford to do the things that I really enjoy.
49. Really involving myself in a marital relationship would mean making compromises in other areas of my life that I am unwilling to accept.
50. I expect to do whatever it takes to make my spouse/partner feel loved, supported, and cared for.
51. I expect to devote a regular time each day to being alone with my spouse to catch up on what is happening and resolve problems, and/or just relax/play together.
52. Although others may work with me in completing certain aspects of my job I want to be the one who makes the major decisions regarding my work and how it gets done.
53. Having children is not one of my life goals.
54. I prefer to leave most of the day-to-day decisions regarding my work to someone else.
55. I expect to put a lot of effort into building and maintaining my marital relationship.
56. Feeling successful in my job/career is essential to my feeling good about myself.
57. I could never be truly happy unless I was married to someone I loved and respected.
58. It is important to me to feel effective/successful as a parent.

CHOOSE: (1) Disagree, (2) Mostly Disagree, (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree, (4) Mostly Agree, (5) Agree

59. I value being successful in my job/career and expect to devote the necessary time and effort needed to be successful.
60. Becoming seriously involved in moving ahead in my career involves costs in other areas of my life that I am unwilling to accept.

APPENDIX B
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

ID# _____ AGE (in years) _____

WHEN APPROPRIATE, PLACE THE CORRESPONDING NUMBER FOR THE
ANSWER IN THE RIGHT HAND COLUMN.

SEX: (1) Female (2) Male _____

RACE: (1) Caucasian (2) Black (3) Hispanic (4) Other _____

ARE YOU CURRENTLY A FULL-TIME EMPLOYEE (40 hrs)?
(1) No (2) Yes _____

HAVE ANY CHILDREN? (1) No (2) Yes _____

RELATIONSHIP STATUS: (1) Single, no current
relationship
(2) Single, but in current
relationship
(3) Engaged
(4) Married
(5) Divorced _____

CLASS: (1) Freshman
(2) Sophomore
(3) Junior
(4) Senior
(5) Graduate _____

HAVE YOU DECIDED ON A MAJOR? (1) No (2) Yes . . . _____

If yes, name of major: _____

APPENDIX C
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

You are being asked to respond to a group of statements. It is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers. There will be no attempt to determine how you do or do not function as a person. The purpose is to determine (based on the responses of you and many others) those statements that are appropriate for use in a later form. It is not expected that you will be at risk or that you will receive any immediate benefits by your participation. Your responses will be kept confidential, within legal limits, and are solely intended to aid us in our research.

If you have any questions concerning this after you have completed the questionnaire, please feel free to contact me, Jack E. Clark, at 392-0731, Monday and Wednesday, from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

You are free to withdraw your consent to participate without any prejudice to you. No monetary compensation will be offered. Please read the following statement and sign your name in the appropriate place.

APPENDIX D

FACTOR LOADINGS FOR ITEMS FOLLOWING PRINCIPAL AXES FACTOR ANALYSIS WITH ORTHOGONAL ROTATION USING MALE SAMPLE

Item	Factor					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	.113	.111	-.034	.221	.337	.078
2	.185	-.003	.058	.148	.025	.614
3	-.071	-.339	.004	.038	.095	.251
4	-.066	-.047	-.102	.678	.091	.118
5	.057	.084	.439	.239	.226	.278
6	.395	.224	.014	.096	-.158	.293
7	.005	.102	-.140	-.091	.058	.712
8	-.125	.150	.034	.144	.068	.056
9	-.101	-.136	.008	.107	.201	.374
10	-.085	.104	-.036	.096	.129	.099
11	.112	.031	-.316	-.134	-.043	.548
12	.392	.354	.148	.102	-.022	.095
13	-.191	-.101	.033	-.359	-.138	-.089
14	.012	.081	-.204	-.059	-.047	.241
15	.218	.697	-.123	-.036	-.013	.089
16	.408	.468	.142	.047	.099	.056
17	-.180	-.048	.677	-.076	-.023	-.113
18	-.106	.001	.192	.053	.215	.116
19	-.014	-.024	.245	.076	.070	.439
20	-.001	.029	.659	-.113	.019	.056
21	.133	.658	.143	.086	.095	-.128
22	.053	-.088	-.018	-.249	-.230	-.054
23	.041	.024	-.474	-.051	.081	.195
24	.103	.013	.140	.133	.164	.116
25	-.088	-.002	.283	.038	.092	.484
26	.105	.742	-.021	-.031	.155	.019
27	-.064	-.162	-.118	-.178	-.237	-.117
28	-.211	.129	.546	.020	.047	-.088
29	.291	.664	-.037	.111	.055	.206
30	.111	.179	.086	.637	.100	.093
31	-.053	-.430	.129	-.151	.026	.224
32	.729	.188	-.138	.091	-.021	-.113
33	-.419	-.592	-.015	-.058	-.018	.157
34	.275	.047	.092	.096	.450	-.289
35	.705	.273	-.277	-.040	.122	-.070
36	-.033	.130	.119	.005	.732	.067

Item	Factor					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
37	-.292	-.166	.411	.014	.091	.118
38	.239	.718	.009	-.022	.025	.034
39	.588	.074	-.169	.015	.187	.159
40	-.054	.010	.741	.065	.127	-.034
41	.130	.688	.028	.029	-.003	.097
42	-.560	-.326	.047	-.073	.104	-.062
43	.639	.113	-.129	.052	.114	.151
44	-.364	-.331	.022	-.109	-.082	-.020
45	-.009	.005	.108	.182	.703	.228
46	.116	.055	.079	.693	.274	-.119
47	.601	.490	-.052	.120	.034	.008
48	-.014	.113	.054	-.011	-.067	-.077
49	-.150	-.411	.096	-.043	-.020	.221
50	.328	.291	-.043	.048	.040	.119
51	.319	.154	-.150	.053	.037	.107
52	.142	.074	.124	.579	.217	-.110
53	-.499	-.497	-.079	.048	.087	-.068
54	-.279	-.030	.161	-.415	-.090	.115
55	.558	.295	-.232	-.000	.106	-.096
56	.201	.104	-.092	.328	.545	-.088
57	.189	.589	-.033	.207	-.007	-.049
58	.710	.311	-.079	.115	.139	-.019
59	.163	-.001	.069	.257	.661	-.000
60	.155	.094	.061	-.186	-.241	-.064
Column Sum of Squared Loadings	5.46	5.87	3.18	2.80	2.87	2.74

Item	Factor				
	7	8	9	10	11
1	.046	-.012	.076	-.390	.128
2	.081	-.095	.103	-.133	.038
3	-.283	.204	.085	.305	-.217
4	-.095	-.046	-.105	-.071	-.062
5	.010	.169	-.199	-.063	-.003
6	.174	-.008	-.020	.017	.066
7	.031	.007	-.008	.020	.000
8	.041	-.075	.627	.043	.021
9	.172	.006	.077	.069	-.085
10	.089	.574	-.143	.109	-.055
11	.009	.049	.045	.030	.051
12	-.117	-.001	-.097	-.082	-.023
13	.158	.031	.065	.578	-.084
14	-.053	-.070	.094	.339	.077
15	.029	.108	.241	-.116	.010
16	-.228	.099	-.100	-.075	-.267
17	-.068	-.035	.193	-.038	.012
18	-.067	-.124	.553	-.047	.006
19	-.245	.370	.030	-.011	.459
20	-.189	.080	-.043	-.090	.039
21	.025	.010	-.007	.167	.102
22	.147	.393	.079	.109	-.149
23	.029	.092	.019	.117	-.193
24	.048	-.068	-.017	-.101	.538
25	-.230	.288	.054	-.057	.321
26	.105	.015	.082	-.019	-.064
27	.200	.112	-.094	.300	-.137
28	.031	.003	.117	.080	-.102
29	-.084	.213	.017	-.134	-.078
30	.002	.069	.218	-.022	.180
31	-.166	.401	.221	.051	-.264
32	.132	-.074	.111	-.080	.104
33	.006	.102	.247	-.029	-.190
34	.071	-.076	.194	-.128	.367
35	.043	.010	.054	-.050	.132
36	.009	.241	-.048	-.164	-.029
37	-.023	-.058	.176	.145	.153
38	.182	.096	.073	-.000	-.015
39	.296	.018	-.082	-.086	-.021
40	.045	.073	.023	.068	.059
41	.230	-.033	.078	-.108	-.114
42	.026	.132	.277	.115	-.021
43	.095	.047	-.004	-.052	-.147
44	-.016	.208	.435	.166	.005
45	.013	.018	.138	-.138	-.051
46	.052	.023	.054	-.113	.108
47	.024	-.032	-.245	.099	.135
48	-.026	.766	-.031	-.095	.074

Item	Factor				
	7	8	9	10	11
49	-.154	.272	.404	.103	-.155
50	.614	-.006	-.036	-.019	.010
51	.566	.121	-.001	.015	.011
52	.216	.047	.110	-.205	.025
53	.057	-.013	.332	.139	.059
54	-.220	.240	.060	.285	.074
55	.284	-.057	-.130	.110	.230
56	-.081	-.126	.081	.084	.110
57	-.090	-.027	-.166	.233	.255
58	.093	-.075	-.158	.159	.081
59	.061	-.133	.080	.003	.146
60	-.106	.073	.063	.316	-.100
Column Sum of Squared Loadings	1.69	2.03	1.94	1.51	1.50

APPENDIX E

FACTOR LOADINGS FOR ITEMS FOLLOWING PRINCIPAL AXES FACTOR ANALYSIS WITH ORTHOGONAL ROTATION USING FEMALE SAMPLE

Item	Factor					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	.022	-.063	.131	.367	.438	.068
2	-.003	-.006	.095	-.038	.032	.651
3	-.133	-.242	.153	.054	.066	.054
4	.058	.039	.096	.591	.152	.004
5	-.067	-.135	.240	.107	.264	.038
6	.693	-.007	.099	-.004	-.033	.049
7	.146	.082	-.061	-.046	.059	.724
8	-.186	-.018	.218	.199	.458	-.037
9	-.090	.114	-.052	-.019	.119	.634
10	-.101	.096	.096	-.049	.071	-.002
11	.177	.073	-.133	-.032	-.093	.744
12	.565	.370	-.006	-.042	-.068	.043
13	.015	.097	.089	-.472	-.198	.089
14	.173	.114	.094	-.095	-.176	.300
15	.270	.644	-.012	-.139	-.039	.199
16	.587	.493	-.045	-.081	-.041	.033
17	-.094	-.008	.673	-.170	.152	-.026
18	-.260	.115	.234	.111	.445	.268
19	-.027	.155	.085	.016	.014	.375
20	-.023	-.044	.713	.033	.028	.017
21	.308	.580	-.031	-.032	.007	.153
22	.044	.221	-.136	-.228	-.371	.018
23	.096	.169	-.207	.041	-.262	.344
24	-.009	-.089	-.163	.411	.132	-.092
25	.024	.055	.065	.059	-.058	.259
26	.154	.698	.060	-.052	-.102	.106
27	.011	.212	-.037	-.335	-.642	.024
28	-.032	.018	.552	.115	.156	-.155
29	.560	.578	-.074	-.135	-.150	-.008
30	-.026	.012	.023	.654	.251	-.046
31	-.295	-.095	.137	-.030	.208	.121
32	.562	.098	-.109	.038	-.055	.028
33	-.377	-.468	-.003	.076	.058	.125
34	-.007	-.102	-.060	.391	.575	-.186
35	.539	.060	-.213	-.088	-.025	.092
36	-.064	.077	.107	.071	.735	.070

Item	Factor					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
37	-.319	-.089	.324	.013	.373	-.109
38	.194	.658	.005	-.112	-.067	.000
39	.365	.059	-.158	-.084	-.011	-.026
40	-.010	.050	.594	-.055	-.025	.024
41	.103	.668	.042	.052	-.215	.045
42	-.790	-.159	-.018	.014	.074	.034
43	.317	.376	-.201	-.014	-.083	.153
44	-.587	-.177	.106	-.036	.208	-.071
45	-.225	.053	.086	.122	.717	.031
46	-.044	-.080	.046	.643	.229	.043
47	.736	.202	-.022	.020	-.080	.050
48	-.068	.130	.025	-.216	-.126	.035
49	-.261	-.171	.092	.001	.090	-.057
50	.140	.378	-.033	.072	-.018	.082
51	.124	.234	.070	.136	-.123	-.072
52	-.059	.032	-.027	.693	.214	-.033
53	-.709	-.226	.010	.055	.180	-.041
54	.087	.107	.220	-.499	-.084	.016
55	.246	.331	-.055	.041	.018	.060
56	-.025	-.141	-.074	.346	.593	-.010
57	.359	.533	-.021	-.018	.016	-.044
58	.699	.134	-.143	.014	-.017	.062
59	-.082	-.136	.030	.333	.738	.053
60	.203	.136	.066	-.216	-.410	-.001
Column Sum of Squared Loadings	6.05	4.45	2.40	3.37	4.53	2.69

Item	Factor			
	7	8	9	10
1	-.014	-.114	-.080	-.129
2	.047	-.097	.043	.057
3	.580	.091	-.031	-.068
4	.046	.006	-.106	-.058
5	.133	-.205	-.073	.045
6	-.115	-.017	.072	-.001
7	.071	.074	.034	.223
8	.136	-.207	.082	.056
9	.038	.031	-.028	.295
10	.033	.577	.019	.150
11	-.049	.135	-.032	-.013
12	.037	-.104	.112	-.065
13	.062	.265	-.025	-.144
14	-.059	.451	-.118	-.055
15	-.338	.027	-.051	.010
16	.067	-.095	-.011	-.018
17	-.012	.001	.029	.002
18	.278	-.217	.044	.157
19	.016	.056	-.074	.722
20	.045	-.000	-.072	.084
21	-.200	.050	.001	.010
22	-.034	.303	.238	-.000
23	-.109	.206	.199	-.243
24	-.048	-.067	.281	.167
25	.015	.231	-.001	.700
26	-.134	.150	.101	.047
27	.060	-.069	.149	-.037
28	.129	.201	-.071	-.017
29	-.078	.033	.014	.067
30	.103	.091	.007	.064
31	.642	.058	.051	-.020
32	-.211	.056	.491	-.116
33	.516	-.087	.085	-.012
34	-.111	-.118	.037	.106
35	-.164	-.042	.349	.026
36	.166	.116	-.036	.051
37	.083	-.058	-.012	.135
38	-.346	.148	.115	.093
39	-.068	.051	.579	-.035
40	.067	.050	-.095	.004
41	-.182	.149	.110	.061
42	.198	.006	.028	.039
43	.026	.034	.395	.052
44	.130	.112	.061	.045
45	.202	.198	.072	-.091
46	-.038	-.037	-.102	-.035
47	-.276	.102	.080	.128
48	.108	.557	.092	.131

Item	Factor			
	7	8	9	10
49	.600	.066	.016	.004
50	-.534	-.005	.369	-.121
51	-.491	-.037	.337	-.126
52	-.026	-.082	.062	-.051
53	.179	-.046	-.026	-.037
54	.027	.268	-.075	-.040
55	-.556	.142	.364	-.117
56	-.001	-.087	-.002	-.135
57	-.428	.191	-.056	.056
58	-.191	.109	.309	-.045
59	.006	-.092	.064	-.007
60	-.105	.242	.072	.023
Column Sum of Squared Loadings	3.33	1.80	1.74	1.55

REFERENCES

- Albrecht, S. L., Bahr, H. M., & Chadwick, B. A. Changing family and sex roles: An assessment of age differences. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1979, 41, 41-50.
- Allgeier, E. R. Beyond sowing and growing: The Relationship of sex-typing to socialization, family plans, and future orientation. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1973, 5, 217-226.
- Almquist, E. M., & Angrist, S. S. Career salience and atypicality of occupational choice among college women. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970, 32, 242-249.
- Alpert, J. L. Theoretical perspectives on the family life cycle. The Counseling Psychologist, 1981, 9, 25-33.
- Amatea, E. S., & Cross, E. G. Competing worlds, competing standards: Personal control for the professional career woman, wife, and mother. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 1981, 44, 3-10.
- Amatea, E. S., & Cross, E. G. Measuring the impact of life role expectations on life role involvement: Development of an instrument. Unpublished manuscript, 1983.
- Anastasi, A. Psychological testing. (4th ed.). New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1976.
- Anastasi, A. Sex differences: Historical perspectives and methodological implications. Developmental Review, 1981, 1, 187-206.
- Aneshensel, C. S., & Rosen, B. C. Domestic roles and sex differences in occupational expectations. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1980, 43, 121-131.
- Angrist, S. S., Mickelson, R., & Penna, A. N. Sex differences in sex role conceptions and family orientation of high school students. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 1977, 6, 179-186.
- Bahr, S. J. The Internal consistency of Blood and Wolfe's measure of conjugal power: A Research note. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1973, 35, 293-295.

- Bandura, A., & Walters, R. Social learning and personality development. New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston, 1963.
- Beeres, C. A. Women and women issues: A Handbook of tests and measures. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.
- Bem, S. L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.
- Bem, S. L. Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 634-643.
- Bem, S. L., & Lenney, E. Sex-typing and the avoidance of cross-sex behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 33, 48-54.
- Bem, S. L., Martyna, W., & Watson, C. Sex-typing and androgyny: Further explorations of the expressive domain. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 1016-1023.
- Berger, M. Men's new family roles: Some implications for therapists. Family Coordinator, 1979, 28, 638-646.
- Bernard, J. Women and the public interest. Chicago: Aldine, 1971.
- Beutell, N. J., & Greenhaus, J. H. Interrole conflict among married women: The influence of husband and wife characteristics on conflict and coping behaviors. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1982, 21, 99-110.
- Birk, J. M. Interest inventories: A mixed blessing. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1974, 22, 280-286.
- Blaska, B. College women's career and marriage aspirations: A review of the literature. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1978, 19, 302-305.
- Block, J. H. Conceptions of sex role: Some cross-cultural and longitudinal perspectives. American Psychologist, 1973, 28, 512-526.
- Bloch, R. H. Untangling the roots of modern sex roles: A survey of four centuries of change. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 1978, 4, 237-252.
- Blood, R. O., & Wolfe, D. M. Husbands and wives: The dynamics of married living. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1960.

- Brogan, D., & Kutner, N. G. Measuring sex-role orientation: A normative approach. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1976, 38, 31-40.
- Centers, R., Raven, B. H., & Rodriques, A. Conjugal power structure: A reexamination. American Sociological Review, 1971, 36, 264-278.
- Chodorow, N. The reproduction of mothering. Berkley: University of California Press, 1978.
- Constantinople, A. Masculinity - femininity: An exception to a famous dictum. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 389-407.
- Crites, J. O. The career maturity inventory. Monterey, California: CTB/McGraw-Hill, 1978.
- Cromwell, R. E., Olson, D. H., & Fournier, D. G. Tools and techniques for diagnosis and evaluation in marriage and family therapy. Family Process, 1976, 15, 1-49.
- Cromwell, R. E., & Wieting, S. G. Multidimensionality of conjugal decision-making indices: Comparative analyses of five samples. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 1975, 6, 139-152.
- Cronbach, L. J. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 1951, 16, 297-334.
- Davis, H. L. Measurement of husband-wife influence on consumer purchase decisions. Journal of Marketing Research, 1971, 8, 305-312.
- Doherty, P. A., & Schmidt, M. K. Sex typing and self-concept in college women. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1978, 19, 493-497.
- Dubin, R., & Champoux, J. E. Central life interests and job satisfaction. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 1977, 18, 366-377.
- Dunn, M. S. A marriage role expectation inventory--teachers and counselors guide (Rev. ed.). Saluda, North Carolina: Family Life Publications, 1979.
- Dyer, W. G., & Urban, D. The institutionalization of equalitarian family norms. Marriage and Family Living, 1958, 20, 53-58.
- Ericksen, J. A., Yancey, W. L., & Ericksen, E. P. The division of family roles. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1979, 41, 301-313.

- Farkas, G. Education, wage rates, and the division of labor between husband and wife. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1976, 38, 473-483.
- Farmer, H. S. Career and homemaking plans for high school youth. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1983, 30, 40-45.
- Faver, C. A. Achievement orientation, attainment values, and women's employment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1982, 20, 67-80.
- Feldman, H., & Feldman, M. The family life cycle: Some suggestions for recycling. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1975, 37, 277-284.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., & Crites, J. O. Career counseling for women. The Counseling Psychologist, 1979, 8, 33-34.
- Frank, E., Anderson, C., & Rubenstein, D. Marital role ideals and perception of marital role behavior in distressed and non-distressed couples. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 1980, 6, 55-63.
- Fuchs, R. Different meanings of employment for women. Human Relations, 1971, 24, 495-499.
- Garnets, L., & Pleck, J. H. Sex role identity, androgyny, and sex role transcendence: A sex role strain analysis. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1979, 3, 270-283.
- Gaudreau, P. A. Factor analysis of the Bem Sex Role Inventory. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45, 299-302.
- Gilbert, G. A., Deutsch, J., & Strahan, R. F. Feminine and masculine dimensions of the typical, desirable, and ideal woman and man. Sex Roles, 1978, 4, 767-778.
- Gilbert, L., Holahan, C. K., & Manning, L. Coping with conflict between professional and maternal roles. Family Relations, 1981, 30, 419-426.
- Gottlieb, P. College youth and the meaning of work. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1975, 24, 116-124.
- Granbois, D. H., & Willett, R. P. Equivalence of family role measures based on husband and wife data. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1970, 32, 68-72.
- Greenhaus, J. H. An investigation of the role of career salience in vocational behavior. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1971, 1, 209-216.

- Greenhaus, J. H. A factorial investigation of career salience. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1973, 3, 95-98.
- Greenhaus, J. H. Career salience as moderator of the relationship between satisfaction with occupational preference and satisfaction with life in general. Journal of Psychology, 1974, 86, 53-55.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Connolly, T. F. An investigation of career exploration among undergraduate business students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1982, 23, 314-319.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Simon, W. E. Self-esteem, career salience, and the choice of an ideal occupation. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1976, 8, 51-58.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Simon, W. E. Career salience, work values, and vocational indecisions. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1977, 10, 104-110.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Sklarew, N. D. Some sources and consequences of career exploration. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1981, 18, 1-12.
- Guertin, W. H., & Bailey, J. D. Introduction to modern factor analysis. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Edward Brothers, Inc., 1970.
- Haavio-Mannila, E. Satisfaction with family, work, leisure, and life among men and women. Human Relations, 1971, 24, 585-601.
- Hall, D. T., & Gordon, F. E. Career choices of married women: Effects on conflict, role behavior and satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 58, 42-48.
- Hardesty, S. A., & Betz, N. E. The relationship of career salience, attitudes toward women and demographic and family characteristics to marital adjustment in dual career couples. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1980, 17, 242-250.
- Harrison, J. B. Men's roles and men's lives. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 1978, 4, 324-336.
- Hath, C. M. Measuring women's interests: How useful? Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1973, 51, 539-545.

- Hayes, J. Occupational choice and the perception of occupational roles. Occupational Psychology, 1969, 43, 15-22.
- Hefner, R., Rebecca, M., & Oleshansky, B. Development of sex-role transcendence. Human Development, 1975, 18, 143-158.
- Heilburn, C. G. Toward a recognition of androgyny. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1973.
- Heneman, H. G., & Schwab, D. P. Evaluation of research on expectancy theory predictions of employee role performance. Psychological Bulletin, 1972, 78, 1-9.
- Hiller, D. V., & Philliber, W. W. Predicting marital and career success among dual-worker couples. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1982, 44, 53-62.
- Holahan, C. K., & Gilbert, L. A. Conflict between major life roles: Women and men in dual-career couples. Human Relations, 1979, 32, 451-467.
- Holahan, C. K., & Gilbert, L. Interrole conflict for working women: Career vs. jobs. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1979, 64, 86-90.
- Johnson, C. L., & Johnson, F. A. Attitudes toward parenting in dual-career families. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1977, 134, 391-395.
- Kamerman, S. B. Work and family in industrialized societies. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 1979, 4, 632-650.
- Kammeyer, K. The feminine role: Analysis of attitude consistency. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1964, 26, 295-305.
- Kassner, M. W. Will both spouses have careers? Predictors of preferred traditional or egalitarian marriages among university students. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1981, 18, 340-355.
- Katz, J. Past and future of the undergraduate woman. Speech presented at Radcliffe College, Cambridge, Mass., 1978.
- Keller, J. F., Maxwell, J. W., & Ritzert, J. Y. Marriage role expectation: A comparison of freshman and senior college students. International Journal of Sociology of the Family, 1978, 8, 81-87.

- Kelly, J. A., Furman, W., & Young, V. Problems associated with the typological measurement of sex roles and androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 1574-1577.
- Klecka, C. O., & Hiller, D. V. Impact of mother's life-style on adolescent gender role socialization. Sex Roles, 1977, 3, 241-255.
- Komarovsky, M. Some problems in role analysis. American Sociological Review, 1973, 38, 649-662.
- Lein, L. Male participation in home life: Impact of social supports and breadwinning responsibility on the allocation of tasks. The Family Coordinator, 1979, 28, 489-495.
- Locksley, A., & Colten, M. E. Psychological androgyny: A case of mistaken identity? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 1017-1031.
- Lozoff, M. Changing life styles and role perceptions of men and women students. Paper presented at Radcliffe College, Cambridge, April 1972.
- Lynn, D. B. The process of learning parental and sex role identification. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1966, 28, 466-470.
- Magrabi, F. M., & Marshall, W. H. Family developmental tasks: A research model. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1965, 27, 454-461.
- Masih, L. K. Career salience and its relation to certain needs, interests, and job values. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1967, 45, 653-658.
- Munley, P. A., Fretz, B. R., & Mills, P. G. Female college student's scores on the men's and women's Strong Vocational Interest Blanks. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20, 285-289.
- Navin, S. Future planning of college women: Counseling implications. The Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1972, 21, 12-17.
- Neugarten, B. L. Continuities and discontinuities of psychological issues into adult life. Human Development, 1969, 12, 121-130.
- Nevill, D. D. Personal communication, August, 1983.

- Nevill, D. D., & Super, D. E. Career maturity and commitment to home and work in college students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, in press.
- O'Neil, J. M. Male sex role conflicts, sexism, and masculinity: Psychological implications for men, women, and the counseling psychologist. The Counseling Psychologist, 1981, 9, 61-80.
- Osmond, M. W., & Martin, P. Y. Sex and sexism: A comparison of male and female sex role attitudes. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1975, 37, 744-758.
- Parsons, T., & Shils, E. A. (Eds.). Toward a general theory of action. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951.
- Pedhazur, E. J., & Tetenbaum, T. J. Bem Sex Role Inventory: A theoretical and methodological critique. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 996-1016.
- Pendleton, B. F., Poloma, M. M., & Garland, T. N. Scales for investigation of the dual-career family. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1980, 42, 269-276.
- Perrucci, C. C., Potter, H. R., & Rhoads, D. L. Determinants of male family-role performance. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1978, 3, 53-66.
- Pleck, J. H. Masculinity-femininity: Current and alternative paradigms. Sex Roles, 1975, 1, 161-177.
- Pleck, J. H. The work-family role system. Social Problems, 1977, 24, 417-427.
- Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R. N. The dual career family. Human Relations, 1969, 22, 3-30.
- * Rebecca, M., Kefner, R., & Oleshansky, B. A model of sex role transcendence. Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32, 197-206.
- Richardson, M. S. Toward an expanded view of careers. The Counseling Psychologist, 1979, 8, 34-35.
- Richardson, M. S. Occupational and family roles: A neglected intersection. The Counseling Psychologist, 1981, 9, 13-23.
- Robinson, B. E. Men caring for the young: An androgynous perspective. The Family Coordinator, 1979, 28, 553-560.

- Robinson, B. E., & Green, M. C. Beyond androgyny: The emergence of sex role transcendence as a theoretical construct. Developmental Review, 1981, 1, 247-265.
- Robinson, S. L., Rotter, M. F., & Wilson, J. Mother's contemporary career decisions: Impact on the family. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1982, 60, 535-538.
- Rodgers, R. H. Comment on "Family developmental tasks: A research model" by Magrabi & Marshall. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1965, 27, 458-461.
- Rooney, C. S. Distinguishing characteristics of the life roles of worker, student, & homemaker for young adults. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1983, 22, 324-342.
- Rosen, B., Jerdee, T., & Prestwich, T. Dual-career marital adjustment: Potential effects of discriminating managerial attitudes. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1975, 37, 565-572.
- Rossi, A. S. Life-span theories and women's lives. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 1980, 6, 4-32.
- Safilios-Rothschild, C. Towards the conceptualization and measurement of work commitment. Human Relations, 1971, 24, 489-493.
- Scanzoni, J., & Fox, G. L. Sex roles, family, and society: The seventies and beyond. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1980, 42, 743-756.
- Sekaran, U. An investigation of career salience of men and women in dual-career families. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1982, 20, 111-119.
- Sekaran, U. How husbands and wives in dual-career families perceive their family and work worlds. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1983, 22, 288-302.
- Skovholt, T. M., & Morgan, J. I. Career development: An outline of issues for men. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1981, 60, 231-237.
- Southall, A. Operational theory of role. Human Relations, 1959, 12, 852-872.
- Stafford, R., Backman, E., & Dibona, P. The division of labor among cohabitating and married couples. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1977, 39, 43-57.

- Strahan, R. F. Remarks on Bem's measurement of psychological androgyny: Alternative methods and a supplementary analysis. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 568-571.
- Straus, M. A. Measuring families. In H. Christensen (Ed.), Handbook of Marriage and Family. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964.
- Straus, M. A., & Brown, B. W. Family measurement techniques: Abstracts of published instruments, 1935-1974. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1978.
- Stein, S. L., & Weston, L. C. Attitudes toward women among female college students. Sex Roles, 1976, 2, 199-202.
- Strong, L. D. Alternative marital and family forms: Their relative attractiveness to college students and correlates of willingness to participate in non-traditional forms. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1978, 40, 493-503.
- Super, D. E. The psychology of careers. New York: Harper, 1957.
- Super, D. E. A life-span, life-space approach to career development. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1980, 16, 282-298.
- Super, D. E. The relative importance of work. Paper presented at the World Seminar of the International Association of Educational and Vocational Guidance on Employment Counseling, September, 1980A.
- Super, D. E. Assessment in career guidance: Toward truly developmental counseling. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1983, 62, 555-562.
- Super, D. E., Mastic, M., & Nevill, D. D. The effects of separate packaging and time intervals on the intercorrelations of seemingly similar test scales. Journal of Occupational Psychology, in press.
- Super, D. E., & Nevill, D. D. The salience inventory. Gainesville, Florida: Work Importance Study, 1983.
- Super, D. E., & Nevill, D. D. Work role salience as a determinant of career maturity in high school students. Journal of Vocational Behavior, in press.
- Super, D. E., Thompson, A. S., Lindeman, R. H., Jordaan, J. P., & Myers, R. A. The career development inventory. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologist Press, 1981.

- Taeuber, K. E., & Sweet, J. A. Family and work: The social life cycle of women. In J. M. Kreps (Ed.), Women and the american economy: A look to the 1980s. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1976.
- Tavris, C. The Cory Complex. Psychology Today, August 1976, p. 60.
- Thibaut, T. W., & Kelly, M. H. The social psychology of groups. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959.
- Thomas, R. G., & Bruning, C. R. Validities and reliabilities of minor modifications of the Central Life Interests and Career Salience questionnaires. Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, 1981, 14, 128-135.
- Tittle, C. K. Career, marriage, and family: Values in adult roles and guidance. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1982, 61, 154-158.
- Tittle, C. K. Studies of the effects of career interest inventories: Expanding outcome criteria to include women's experience. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1983, 22, 148-158.
- Tognoli, J. The flight from domestic space: Men's roles in the household. Family Coordinator, 1979, 28, 599-607.
- Turk, J. L., & Bell, N. W. Measuring power in families. Journal of Marriage and Family, 1972, 34, 215-222.
- Van Sell, M., Brief, A. P., & Schuler, R. S. Role conflict and role ambiguity: Integration of the literature and directions for future research. Human Relations, 1981, 34, 43-71.
- Vogel, S. R., Broverman, I. K., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz, P. S. Maternal employment and perception of sex roles among college students. Developmental Psychology, 1970, 3, 384-391.
- Voss, J. Concepts of self, ideal self, and ideal woman held by college men and women: A comparison study. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1980, 21, 50-57.
- Whitney, D. R. Predicting from expressed vocational choice: A review. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1969, 48, 279-286.
- Wilkes, R. E. Husband-wife influence in purchase decisions: A confirmation and extension. Journal of Marketing Research, 1975, 12, 224-227.

- Wrightsman, L. S. Social psychology in the seventies.
Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company,
1972.
- Yockey, J. M. Role theory and the female sex role. Sex
Roles, 1978, 4, 917-927.
- Zytowski, P. G. Avoidance behavior in vocational
motivation. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1965, 43,
746-750.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH


Jack Edward Clark was born in Flint, Michigan, on November 16, 1952, the second of two sons born to Edward and Shirley Clark. At the age of seven, Jack's family moved to Bradenton, Florida, where he enjoyed living out his youth. After two years of college, Jack worked in Fort Lauderdale, where he met his wife, Barbara. After a backpacking trip to Europe, he moved to Long Island, New York and was married in 1974. Jack came to Gainesville in 1975 to complete his education. He received his bachelors degree in psychology at the University of Florida in 1978. After working at the North Florida Evaluation and Treatment Center, in Gainesville, he began his graduate studies. He completed his specialist degree in marriage and family counseling at the Department of Counselor Education, University of Florida, in 1981.

Jack is the proud father of two sons, Brian and Michael. Together, he and his wife have worked at raising a good family and maintaining a good marriage.


Jack is a licensed Marriage and Family Therapist and a National Certified Counselor. Upon graduation, he plans to

move to Charlotte, North Carolina, and begin working in the Personnel Research Department of the International Business Machines (IBM) Corporation.


I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.


Ellen S. Amatea, Chairperson
Assistant Professor of
Counselor Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.


Larry Loesch
Professor of Counselor
Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.


Stephen Olejnik
Associate Professor of Founda-
tions of Education

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the Department of Counselor Education in the College of Education and to the Graduate School, and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

April, 1984

Dean for Graduate Studies
and Research